

School of Theology at Claremont



1001 1398354



The Library
SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY
AT CLAREMONT

WEST FOOTHILL AT COLLEGE AVENUE
CLAREMONT, CALIFORNIA

OF THEOLOGY
CLAREMONT, CALIF.

THE LIVES OF THE POPES

VOL. XVIII.

1070
M3
1925
V. 18

THE
LIVES OF THE POPES
IN THE MIDDLE AGES

BY THE

RT. REV. MONSIGNOR HORACE K. MANN, D.D.

"De gente Anglorum, qui maxime familiares Apostolicæ Sedis semper
existunt" (*Gesta Abb. Fontanel.*, A.D. 747-752, ap. M. G. SS. II. 289).

RECTOR OF THE COLLEGIO BEDA, ROME; CORRESPONDING MEMBER OF THE ROYAL ACADEMY OF
HISTORY OF SPAIN; MEMBER OF THE ACCADEMIA D'ARCADIA AND OF THE R. SOCIETÀ ROMANA
DI STORIA PATRIA.

THE POPES AT THE HEIGHT OF THEIR
TEMPORAL INFLUENCE

INNOCENT II. TO BLESSED BENEDICT XI.
1130-1305

VOL. XVIII.

BONIFACE VIII. TO BL. BENEDICT XI., 1294-1304

LONDON:

KEGAN PAUL, TRENCH, TRUBNER & CO., LTD.
ST. LOUIS, MO.: B. HERDER BOOK CO.

1932

Theology Library
SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY
AT CLAREMONT
California

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY
STEPHEN AUSTIN AND SONS, LTD., HERTFORD

A LIST OF THE PRINCIPAL ABBREVIATIONS
USED IN THIS VOLUME

- Potthast . . . = *Regesta Pontificum Romanorum*, ed.
A. Potthast, 2 vols., Berlin, 1874.
- Reg. . . . = One of the volumes of the *Registres
des Papes* in course of publica-
tion by the French Schools of
Athens and of Rome, ed.
Fontemoing, Paris.
- L. P. . . . = *Liber Pontificalis*, 2 vols., ed.
L. Duchesne, Paris, 1886.
- M. G. H. or Pertz . . = *Monumenta Germaniae Historica*,
either *Scriptores* (M. G. SS.), or
Epistolae (M. G. Epp.), or *Poetae*
(M. G. PP.).
- P. G. . . . = *Patrologia Graeca*, ed. Migne, Paris.
- P. L. . . . = *Patrologia Latina*, ed. Migne, Paris.
- R. I. SS. . . . = *Rerum Italicarum Scriptores*, ed.
Muratori, Milan, 1723 ff., or the
new ed. in course of publication.
- R. F. SS. . . . = *Recueil des Historiens des Gaules*,
ed. Bouquet and others, Paris,
1738 ff.
- R. S., following an edition = The edition of the Chronicles, etc.,
of a book. of Great Britain and Ireland,
published under the direction of
the Master of the Rolls.
- Rymer or Foedera . . = *Foedera, Literae, etc., ab anno 1101
ad nostra usque tempora*,
accurante T. Rymer. Unless the
contrary is stated, we quote
from the original ed., London,
1704 ff.

Other abbreviations will be readily understood by reference to the *Sources* prefixed to each biography.

The sign † placed before a date indicates that the date in question is the year of the death of the person after whose name the sign and date are placed. The sign * placed before the title of a book indicates that the author of these volumes has seen the book in question favourably mentioned, but has not examined it himself.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	V
BONIFACE VIII. (1294-1303)	I
Chapter I. Early Years and Career previous to Election to the Papacy. The Character of Benedict Gaetani as Pope. Rumours about it ; what was said about it by his enemies ; what by his friends and impartial people. His aims, his piety, his love of justice, his learning	5
„ II. Election and Coronation of Benedict Gaetani. He announces his election, and annuls many of the acts of Celestine V. Louis of Anjou. Creations of Cardinals	47
„ III. The Affairs of Sicily. The Hungarian Succession	64
„ IV. The Empire. The Cities of North Italy and Tuscany	113
„ V. The States of the Church. Rome. The Jubilee. Art	152
„ VI. Pope Boniface and the Colonnas	205
„ VII. The British Isles	226
„ VIII. Boniface VIII. and France. England and Flanders	266
„ IX. France. Serious troubles between Boniface and Philip the Fair. The Bull “ Clericis laicos ”. Bernard Saisset, bishop of Pamiers, and the fatal trouble brought about by him between Boniface and Philip	290

	PAGE
Chapter X. The Sacrilege of Anagni	371
„ XI. Short Notices regarding the Crusades and the East, the Religious Orders, the Jews, Denmark, etc. The Character of Boniface VIII.	393
BLESSED BENEDICT XI. (1303-1304)	421
Chapter I. Early Career. Election and Coronation .	423
„ II. Philip of France and the Sacrilege of Anagni	439
„ III. The Empire ; Italy—Work for Peace in Florence, etc. ; States of the Church ; Sicily ; the East—Crusade	456
„ IV. The British Isles	470
„ V. Benedict and the Religious Orders. Finance. Miscellaneous Items. Death of the Pope	473
INDEX	487

BONIFACE VIII.

A.D. 1294-1303.

Sources.—As usual, of the first importance for the *life* of Boniface is the *Register* of the Pope himself. Up to date (1926), Messrs. Georges Digard, Maurice Faucon, and Antoine Thomas have published in three volumes (each vol. containing the letters of three years) the “common and curial letters” of Boniface to the number of 5,408. Though the publication was begun in 1885, neither the introduction nor the index has unfortunately yet appeared.

As usual also, many of the most important bulls, etc., of Boniface were never registered, but have, in many cases, been preserved in the Archives of the places to which they were sent, whence they have often been copied and published in such collections as Rymer's *Foedera*. E. Déprez, too, has printed short notices of papal briefs, etc., which he discovered in the archives of different cities of Italy, and which are frequently not found in the Registers of the different Popes.¹ For instance, in the Archives of St. Nicholas of Bari, he found a letter² which shows the recognized supreme position of the mediaeval Popes even in certain international temporal affairs. It is a document issued by Boniface, exempting all clerics from all tolls. Similarly a number of papal letters have been preserved in the archives of certain private families, whence also some have been published. Thus G. B. Garinci has printed *Documenti scelti dell' archivio dei Gaetani*, Rome, 1846. Among them (p. 16) is a brief of Boniface directed to the Commune of Rieti (Feb. 9, 1298), bidding it furnish two, or at least one, hundred infantry for service against the Colonnas.

But especially must we direct attention to the recent splendid publications of one of the chief representatives of the Gaetani family, the Duca, Gelasio Gaetani. From the family archives, he has already published: *Regesta Chartarum*, Perugia, 1922 (the

¹ *Recueil des Documents Pontificaux* (belonging to the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries), Rome, 1900.

² *Ib.*, n. 19, p. 44.

documents begin with the tenth century), and *Domus Caietana*, the documented history of the Gaetani family, Sancasciano Val di Pesa, 1927. These works are not yet terminated.

Dr. H. Finke, from the archives of Barcelona, has published in the first volume of his *Acta Aragonensia* ¹ (Berlin and Leipzig, 1908), a number of most important documents relating to Boniface, and also in his *Aus den Tagen Bonifaz VIII.*, Munster-i-W., 1902.

A few facts regarding the pontificate of Boniface may be found in the brief fragment of a Chronicle (1294-1311) published by U. Balzani at the end of his article on "Landolfo e Giovanni Colonna", in vol. viii of the *Archivio della R. Soc. Rom. di storia patria*.

Historians often cited in connection with the career of Boniface are Ferretus Ferreti, of Vicenza, and the Bolognese Dominican Franciscus Pipinus. The former, born about 1295, wrote (c. 1330) a history of Italy from 1250 to 1318, which has been published incompletely by Muratori, *R. I. SS.*, vol. ix, and more recently (1908 ff.) in three volumes by C. Cipolla, Rome, in the series *Fonti per la storia d'Italia*. This is the edition we shall use—*Historia rerum in Italia gestarum*. Ferreti's attempt to imitate classical authors has caused his style to be stilted and somewhat obscure, and his lively imagination and taste for satire have led him to be more desirous of presenting a bright picture than sombre truth. Hence he shows himself very unjust towards Boniface VIII., and this quite in accordance with his custom; for, remarks a student of his works: "it is to be noted that among many rumours . . . he never fails to select that which redounds to the dishonour of someone in power—a satirical propensity not easily to be reconciled with a real love of truth." ²

Among other works, the Bolognese Franciscus Pipinus, about 1320, produced a universal chronicle in thirty-one books going down to 1317, ap. *R. I. SS.*, vol. ix. Unfortunately he was rather a careless compiler, and because he was a lover of the marvellous,

¹ In the *Journal des Savants*, June and July, 1908, Élie Berger has given a most interesting analysis of the *Acta A.* in so far as they relate to James II. of Aragon's dealings with the Holy See and with France: "Jacques II. d'Aragon, le Saint Siège et la France."

² Prof. Zanella in Balzani's *Early Chronicles of Europe, Italy*, p. 273. His inexactness, "his patent hostility to B." are insisted on (p. 50) by G. Levi in his by no means friendly study on "Bonifazio VIII. e Firenze" in vol. v of the *Archivio Rom. di. S.P.*

he retails sensational fables about Boniface. Moreover, both he and Ferreti were Ghibellines.

Some information regarding the doings of Boniface is also given us by a section of the numerous polemical writers of his time, such as Peter Paludanus († 1342)¹; the famous canonist, Giovanni d'Andrea, the friend of Petrarch²; John Peter Olivi,³ Angelo Clareno,⁴ Ægidius Colonna,⁵ etc.⁶

For ancient biographies of Boniface we have to fall back on Bernard Guidonis (ap. *R. I. SS.*, iii, p. 670 ff.), and the hostile Amalricus (*ib.*, pt. ii, p. 435 ff.), though cardinal Stefaneschi (1296) has given us a metrical account of his election and coronation.⁷ In the Vatican library (Cod. Urb., n. 1675) there is a manuscript *life* of Boniface. It would appear to date from the fourteenth century, and is full of abuse of its subject. We have already spoken of the historical works of Ptolemy of Lucca, but we must note here that there are two versions of the twenty-fourth book of his *Historia ecclesiastica*, ap. Muratori, *R. I. SS.*, xi. The second version, drawn from a Paduan MS., treats of the pontificates of Boniface VIII. and his two immediate successors, and most be compared with the first version. It is printed by Muratori, *l.c.*, p. 1217 ff.

Modern Works.—Of the modern biographies of Boniface VIII., we shall only cite the most important. The first modern writer to realize that at any rate Benedict Gaetani was a great man, and that, although, because he failed to read the signs of the times, his imperious character proved disastrous to himself and to the temporal position of the Papacy, he was nevertheless an heroic figure, and was one who is generally said to be a countryman of ours, "John Ross" (Joannes Rubeus) "of the English congregation of the Benedictine order, and one time procurator in the Roman Curia". It appears, however, that despite belonging to an

¹ In his *De causa immediata Eccles. potestatis*, Paris, 1506, of which extracts are given in Reynaldus, *Ann.*, 1328, nn. 30-2. He became Patriarch of Jerusalem in 1329.

² On G. d'A. and his works, cf. Tiraboschi, *Storia della let. Ital.*, v, p. 303 ff.

³ Cf. *supra*, Vol. XVII, p. 327, n. 3.

⁴ *Ib.*, p. 315.

⁵ *Ib.*, p. 318, and Tosti, *Bonif. VIII.*, p. 345 f., Eng. trans.

⁶ Cf. R. Scholz, *Die Publizistik zur Zeit Philipps des Schönen und Bonifaz VIII.*, Stuttgart, 1903.

⁷ *Supra*, Vol. XVII, p. 251. On the Stefaneschi of the Trastevere, see G. Navone ap. *Archiv. Rom. di storia*, vol. i, p. 226 ff.

English Congregation, Rubeus was a native of Chiusi.¹ He published his *Bonifacius VIII.* in Latin in Rome (1651). If W. Drumann (*Geschichte Bonifacius VIII.*, 2 vols., Königsberg, 1852) is hostile to the memory of Boniface, the Benedictine abbot L. Tosti (*Storia di Bonifazio VIII.*, 2 vols., Monte Cassino, 1846) is strongly in his favour. The abbot's book is of acknowledged excellence, if not of minute accuracy, was republished two or three times, and has been translated into French (Paris, 1854), by the Abbé Marie-Duclos, and into English by Mgr. E. Donnelly (New York, 1911). This last is the edition which we shall generally quote.² Valuable and suggestive, but not partial to Boniface are the works of Rocquain: *La papauté au moyen âge* (Nicolas I., Grégoire VII., Innocent III., Boniface VIII.), Paris, 1881, and *La cour de Rome et l'esprit de réforme avant Luther*, 3 vols., Paris, 1893 ff., and of V. Le Clerc and E. Renan in *Hist. littér. de la France au quatorzième siècle*, 2 vols., 2nd ed., 1865.³ Still very useful is the apology for Boniface which was published by Cardinal Wiseman in the *Dublin Review* for Nov., 1841, and reproduced in Rev. J. Murphy's ed. of his *Essays*, p. 471 ff., London, 1888. The Abbé J. B. Christophe gives a short account of Boniface in his well-known *Hist. de la Papauté pendant le XIV^e siècle*, 3 vols., Paris, 1855. In 1886, there was published in Rome a brief biography of Boniface by a member of the Gaetani family, Mgr. Cris. Gaetani, one time bishop of Foligno (1634-42). Its editor states that though lively and even poetical, its author is impartial.

Other sources and works in connection with the pontificate of Boniface VIII. will be given at the head of the different chapters.

CONTEMPORARY SOVEREIGNS.

(See under NICHOLAS IV.)

EMPERORS IN THE WEST.

Adolf of Nassau, 1292-8.

Albert of Hapsburg, 1298-1308.

¹ Cf. Mgr. G. Mercati in *Cronistoria dell' Anno S.* (1925), p. 1192, quoting *Cod. Vat. Barb. Lat.*, n. 2497.

² Some mistakes have crept into this translation, due, as Mgr. Donnelly informs me, to a little want of care on the part of the one who revised it for the Press.

³ The *Boniface VIII.* of J. Chantrel, Paris, 1862, is a small vol. of about 200 pp., 16mo.

CHAPTER I.

EARLY YEARS AND CAREER PREVIOUS TO ELECTION TO THE PAPACY. THE CHARACTER OF BENEDICT GAETANI AS POPE. RUMOURS ABOUT IT: WHAT WAS SAID ABOUT IT BY HIS ENEMIES; WHAT BY HIS FRIENDS AND IMPARTIAL PEOPLE. HIS AIMS, HIS PIETY, HIS LOVE OF JUSTICE, HIS LEARNING.

MUCH has been written about the family of Benedict Gaetani; and it is asserted by some authors that he was of the same family as Pope Gelasius II., i.e., of the family of the Gaetani of Gaeta. It is, however, only certain that Benedict's immediate ancestors were knights of Anagni. While his grandfather is said by some to have been a certain Matthias, his father was certainly Loffred (or Roffred) Gaetani, and, as his mother was a niece or sister-in-law of Alexander IV., he was connected with the great family of the Conti.¹ He had at least one brother called like his father, Loffred (or Roffred), another called John, and two sisters.²

Unfortunately it cannot perhaps be asserted confidently that we know the year in which Benedict was born. Ferreti's statement that he was eighty-six when he died is called in question, and even the statement

Family of
Benedict G.

Year of
birth.

¹ Villani, *Chron.*, viii, 6, who says that the Gaetani were a Ghibelline family. Cf. Gregorovius, *Rome*, v, pt. ii, p. 528 f., and p. 540, from the archives of the Gaetani. See also G. Caetani, "Margherita Aldobrandesca e i Caetani" in *Archivio di Stor. Pat.*, 1921, p. 5 ff.; and the same author's fine vol. *Caetanorum genealogia*, Perugia, 1920. See also Tosti, *B. VIII.*, p. 37. "Clara domus genuit" Stefaneschi, *Coron. Bonif.*, c. 3. See G. Gaetani, *Domus G.*, p. 43.

² See a privilege granted to Roffred by Charles II. of Naples ap. Carinci, *Doc. di Gaetani*, p. 16; and Gaetani, *l.c.*, p. 48.

of Ross that he was "over eighty" at that time cannot be proved.¹ All that can be said with certainty is that in the midst of his controversy with Philip of France (1302), Boniface declared that for forty years he had been an expert (*sumus experti*) in Canon Law,² and that in 1298 he complained of "the trials of old age".³ We may conclude, then, that probably Ferreti was not far wrong, and that Benedict was born in the second decade of the thirteenth century.

Places of
education.

There is, strange to say, even more uncertainty as to the schools in which Benedict received his education than as to the exact date of his birth. There would, however, appear to be a tradition that he received his first instruction from the Franciscans of Velletri, and especially from bro. Leonardo Patrasso, who is supposed to have been his uncle.⁴

It is also believed that it was in the University of Paris that he made his first studies in that branch of learning, Canon Law, in which he afterwards became so distinguished. This tradition is borne out to some extent by his enthusiastic words about that University when he became Pope. After the grace of God, he said, the one wish of his heart was that in his time the University should not suffer any loss,⁵ and he recalled with affection

¹ Rubeus, *Bonif. VIII.*, p. 221. His calculation is based on the idea that Benedict was secretary to cardinal Ottoboni on his legation to England in 1255. The legation was really in 1265. Cf. Ferreti, *Hist.*, vol. i, p. 164.

² See his votum, ap. Dupuy, *Hist. du diffend.*, p. 77.

³ Writing to Philip IV. he complains of illness and "jam sentire conspicimur onera senectutis". Ep. of Dec. 29, 1298, ap. E. Boutaric in *Notices et extraits*, vol. xx, p. 129 f. In 1299, too, he told King Edward that he was very old (*ætate grandevo*) and ill. Rymer, ii, 559-60.

⁴ Cf. Tosti, p. 97, quoting Teuli, *Teatr. Stor. di Velletri*, L. ii, c. 5.

⁵ Denifle, *Chart. Univ. Paris.*, ii, nn. 592, 622.

how the Church of Paris had nourished and honoured him.¹

However all that may be, it is certain that when he was about twenty years of age he went to his uncle Pietro Gaetani, who was bishop of Todi, and there attended the lectures of a doctor of laws named Ronchetti or Bartholi.² It was whilst a student at Todi that the young "Ghibelline" was wounded in the head in a faction fight.³ Despite this, when Benedict in due course became Boniface VIII., he spoke, in a bull of Sept. 20, 1295, most affectionately of the city and Church of Todi, and recalled with gratitude how, when he was a member of its College, it had cherished him as a son.⁴ His affection for the beloved city of his student days was reciprocated by its people, and so, when they passed laws forbidding strangers to acquire land in their commune, they specially exempted "those of the house of the lord Boniface VIII. whom we wish to have as citizens of our City".⁵

Boniface himself tells us something of his early years. Whilst he was yet a youth (*infra etatem adolescentiæ*), he says, the Church of Anagni, like a loving mother, nourished and honoured him, and provided him with a canonry and a benefice; and, he continues, it was thence that he was step by step promoted to benefices of other churches, and even to ecclesiastical dignities.⁶

¹ *Ib.*, n. 600.

² This from the evidence of one who was studying at Todi at the same time, and who after the death of his schoolfellow, accused him on hearsay of the foulest crimes. Ap. Dupuy, *Hist.*, p. 528. Cf. p. 559.

³ See a document from the Archives of Todi, cited by G. Gaetani, *D.G.*, p. 47. Boniface himself recalls the years of his youth he spent in Todi, *Reg.*, n. 831.

⁴ Gaetani, *l.c.*, p. 53, again quoting from the Archives of Todi, c. iii, 1.

⁵ *Ib.*, citing the statutes of Todi.

⁶ *Reg.*, n. 400, dated from Anagni, Sept. 20, 1295. Cf. n. 3149.

Consistorial
advocate,
notary, and
cardinal.

Benedict began his long career in the papal curia as an advocate, and, under Nicholas III., he became a proto-notary. Whilst still but a notary,¹ he was employed by Nicholas III. in the arduous and delicate negotiations by which he brought about a peaceful understanding between Rudolf and Charles of Anjou. The Pope told the latter that, on account of the work that was pressing upon him from every quarter, he could not attend to all the details of the above-mentioned negotiations himself, and hence had entrusted them to Matteo Rosso (Orsini), cardinal-deacon of Sta. Maria in Portico, and "to our beloved son, Master Benedict of Anagni, our notary who is known to have a sound knowledge of the whole affair".²

After his considerable experience in the papal chancery, Martin IV., the successor of Nicholas, raised him to the dignity of cardinal-deacon of S. Niccolo in Carcere (Apr. 12, 1281). By one Pope after another he was trusted, employed, and rewarded. He went with the legate cardinal Ottoboni Fieschi, afterwards Hadrian V., to England, and with cardinal Simon de Brion, afterwards Martin IV., to France.³ In connection with his visit to England it is very interesting, especially to Englishmen, to learn from a comparatively recently discovered document, that Benedict was, along with the

¹ Stefaneschi, *Coron. Bonif.*, c. 3, p. 89, ed. Seppelt.

"Hinc scribe manus papalis adeptus,
Omnia pertractans, clarus dictamine."

² Ep. to Charles of Jan. 25, 1280, ap. Kaltenbrunner, *Actenstücke*, p. 205. Tosti, pp. 41-2, has made a variety of mistakes over this matter. He sends Benedict to Germany with Cardinal Matthew Acquasparta. Now it was Cardinal Jerome Masci, afterwards Nicholas IV., who was sent to Germany (Potthast, n. 21725, July 5, 1280), and he followed *Paul*, not Nicholas, Bishop of Tripoli. Benedict as *notary*, not as cardinal, was attached not to M. Ac., but to Cardinal Matteo Rosso, and he accompanied him to Charles and not to Rudolf.

³ Cf. *Reg.*, n. 2865, where Boniface recalls his mission to France with Cardinal Gerard in 1290.

cardinal, besieged in the Tower of London by the Earl of Gloucester, and that he was delivered by the young Prince Edward.¹

Another document published in the same year as the one just cited gives us some very valuable details of Benedict's mission to Paris in 1290. He was then a cardinal and went in company with cardinal Gerard. They had been sent by the Minorite Pope, Nicholas IV., to allay the great outcry which had been raised in France against the bulls of Pope Martin IV. giving the friars the right of hearing confessions, preaching, etc.² The cardinals convoked a national council to meet at Paris (1290), and then were called upon by some to revoke the privileges granted to the friars. Benedict replied for his colleague. He declared that they had been sent to confirm the friars' privileges, and condemned the folly of the masters of the University for treating them as though the Roman curia had granted them without careful deliberation. He would have the masters know, he said, that the Roman curia had not the light feathered feet of thoughtlessness, but the leaden ones of caution ("non habet pedes plumeos sed plumbeos").

The masters, however, or at any rate some of them, were not silenced. Henry of Ghent called them together and urged opposition. "If we can hold discussions on the Gospels why not on a privilege," he urged. But Benedict, promptly summoning two of the masters, the Franciscan

¹ Cf. J. G. Black, "Edward I. and Gascony in 1300," ap. *Eng. Hist. Rev.*, 1902, where the doc. quoted is printed, p. 522 ff. Speaking when Pope, Boniface said: "Et il nous sovient quant nous feumes en Engleterre ove Sire Ottobon et feumes assege en la Tour de Loundres par le counte de Gloucestre, lors vint cesti Roi (Edw. I.) adoncques juvenceaux pour deliverer nous de ceu siege." Later he adds how Edward had always honoured him, when he was a notary, when a cardinal, and as Pope.

² Cf. Potthast, nn. 21821 (Dec. 13, 1281) and 21837.

John de Murro, afterwards cardinal, and the famous Augustinian, Giles Colonna, afterwards his tried friend, ordered the deposition of Master Henry. Moreover, when a number of masters of the different faculties came to Benedict to beg for Henry's restitution, the cardinal upbraided them for upsetting the world with their senseless disputations. They knew nothing of the state of the universal Church of Christ, but thought they could sit in their chairs and rule it. But the world has been committed to us, and it is for us to have a care of it and not for you. "Professing themselves to be wise they became fools" (Rom. i, 22). Because the lives and learning of the friars have saved many, the privilege shall stand.¹

Granting that the force of the cardinal's language has not suffered at the hands of the friar who has reported it, this incident gives us a good insight into Benedict's forceful and perhaps too *downright* character.

Like Hildebrand, Benedict was the confidant of a succession of Popes.² In all these offices, we are assured by Clement V., whom we are here following, that he did much for the glory of God and for the strengthening of the faith and the extinction of heresy.³ To what extent the admirable work of Benedict was rewarded by his predecessors in the see of Peter is seen especially in two bulls of Martin IV. and Nicholas IV. The former Pontiff, when he made him cardinal, gave him permission (provided that he supplied suitable vicars for such benefices as had the cure of souls attached to them) to retain the benefices which he already held in the dioceses of Langres, Chartres, Lincoln, Lyons,

¹ See the document in Finke, *Aus den tagen B. VIII.*, p. iii ff.

² So says even Pope Clement V. "Prædecessoribus nostris Romanis Pontificibus . . . successivis temporibus, quasi continuo conversatus." Ep. Sept. 13, 1309, "Dudum postquam," ap. Rubeus, p. 230.

³ *Ib.*

Paris, Anagni, Todi, and Terouane, and in connection with the basilica of St. Peter.¹

By Nicholas IV. he was also made Protector of the Order of St. William,² and cardinal-priest of St. Martin (1291). This Pope and Martin IV., who had made him a cardinal-deacon, had both the highest opinion of Benedict. The latter, when he wished to dissuade Charles I. from his stupid and wicked project of fighting a duel with Peter of Aragon, sent Benedict to him in order to add verbal persuasions to the arguments he had used in his letter. He described his envoy as "a man of profound prudence (*consilii*), faithful, shrewd, hard-working, and wise".³ Similarly, Nicholas IV., when sending him with cardinal Gerard to France, speaks of "their great merits, their many virtues, and of their tried uprightness". He knows them also to be "lovers of peace and concord", but he sends them with considerable regret as their presence is of importance to himself.⁴ After this authoritative testimony as to the learning, judgment, and virtue of cardinal Gaetani, there is no need to add that of our own John Peckham, archbishop of Canterbury, who eagerly

Martin IV.
and Nich.
IV. on
Benedict.

¹ *Reg. Mart. IV.*, n. 15; May 6, 1281. *Cf. Reg. Honor. IV.*, n. 826; *Reg. Nich. IV.*, nn. 7074-5, 7346, and 7382. With regard especially to the canonry of Todi, see the letter of Alexander IV., June 8, 1260, and the decree of the Canons of that city, ap. Tosti, p. 455. *Cf. Boniface's own Register*, n. 696, for property of the knights of Calatrava which "when he was in an inferior station" had been granted him for his life. In the famous bull "*Ausculda, fili*" (*Reg.*, 4424) he speaks of being a canon of Lyons.

² *Reg. Nich. IV.*, n. 7422, July 1, 1288.

³ Ep. of Feb. 6, 1283, ap. Raynaldus, *Ann.*, 1283, n. 12. *Cf. Stefaneschi, De elect. Bonif.*, i, c. 2, n. 70 ff., p. 643:

"Fuit mens alto viro, fœcunda juvenus
Et docile ingenium, solers astutia promptum
Obsequium, secura palam prudentia fari
Praesulibus, fecere viam qua tractus in altum
Cresceret."

⁴ Ep. of March 23, 1290, ap. *ib.*, 1290, n. 19.

sought the advice of that man "of venerable discretion".¹ But it may well modify the verdict of Ptolemy of Lucca that, as cardinal, Benedict had no equal in the quick way in which he dispatched the cases that came before the College of Cardinals,² or replied to externs, and that, in consequence of this, he became proud and arrogant and looked down upon everybody. Such, we may object, is not the kind of man whom successive Popes would have picked out to conduct delicate peace negotiations. It is quite possible, as time went on, that conscious of the uprightness of his aims, and of his intellectual powers, he became irritated at the sordid motives that obviously animated many of his opponents, and at the worthless arguments that were often put forward to further unworthy ends, so that the day may have come when he could no longer "bear fools gladly", and showed it; and when, softening the phrase of Dino Compagni, he strove to humble those who (unworthily) opposed him.³ Nor, in view of the confidence bestowed upon him by successive Popes, can we accept the judgment of Villani about him when he says that, whilst he was cardinal, he protected the Ghibellines, and that, whilst Pope, under pretence of being a strong Guelf, he broke up that party.⁴ The notion is altogether too fantastic.

Appearance
of
Boniface.

Before going further and speaking of the character of Benedict as Pope, we may take a glance at his external

¹ Cf. *Litt. Joan. Peckham*, ep. 44, vol. i, p. 49, R. S. Yet the severe Franciscan will not give a benefice to Bartholomew of Ferentino, the cardinal's protégé, because he was ignorant of letters and of English. Ep. 266, ap. *ib.*, i, p. 250 f. Cf. ep. 471.

² Or perhaps: "In the quick way in which he formulated the ideas or position of the College—expeditior ad casus Collegii declarandos." *H.E.*, l. xxiv, c. 36, p. 1203. The Chronicle of "Jordan", c. 236, merely repeats these very words.

³ Compagni, *Chron.*, i, 21, says baldly: "e abassava chi non li consentia." Cf. ii, 2. He refers chiefly to the Colonnas.

⁴ *Chron.*, viii, 6.

figure. For, through face and form, we can often get much more than a glimpse of the real man behind them. To enable us, by a criticism of externals, to form a more correct judgment of the much disputed character of Boniface VIII., it is matter for thankfulness, that more portrait statues, frescoes, and the rest¹ have been preserved of him than of any of his predecessors. Of these likenesses and of the results obtained from the opening of his tomb, a careful study has been made by the author of *Dante and his Italy*,² and of this study we shall with pleasure avail ourselves here.

Boniface, then, was a tall man,³ possessed of "a full oval face with lineaments noble, severe, and dignified", with slightly prominent ears, with head nearly bald, broad brow, full cheeks, and firm massive jaw. While his feet were small, "the hands . . . were long and graceful . . . with tapering fingers and nails. The veins and nerves were clearly marked, telling of a certain delicate sensitiveness to balance the sheer force of the head and face."⁴

Before anything is said of the character of Boniface, it may be well to cite a passage from Rocquain, who will not be suspected of any papal bias, as to the need that there is of showing that character in a true light. "His adversaries have attributed to him all the vices and every

The need of clearing the character of Boniface.

¹ We shall speak of them in Chapter V.

² Pp. 23-5. It is a charming and sympathetic work by my friend Canon L. Ragg.

³ His corpse measured seven and three quarter palms. Cf. G. Gaetani's description, *Domus G.*, p. 59.

⁴ The Canon proceeds to say something of the character of Boniface. "A strong man and highly gifted—his foes are the first to admit it. A man with lofty ideals of a sort, but unscrupulous in his methods of compassing them." The last statement I cannot but regard as altogether too sweeping. "A man of some refinement," he continues, "a man of immense learning and ability."

crime. It is a matter of historic justice to cleanse his character from the mud with which some have striven to cover it, but of which the stain must fall on his accusers." ¹

The
character of
Boniface
according to
his friends
and enemies.

Reserving anything we may have to say ourselves about the character of Boniface till later, we will set out at some length what was said about him by his contemporaries or by men who lived in the century in which he died. We will narrate at first those stories about him which even those who relate them give merely as rumours, but which, while rejected by every modern writer of any standing, are, some of them at least, nearly always quoted by them, and obviously influence their judgment with regard to him. The most commonly quoted of these stories is the one given in the Chronicle assigned to "Rishanger". The author of this chronicle, who wrote the portion in question after 1327,² says that Celestine V. prophetically uttered the following about Boniface: "Ascendisti ut vulpes, regnabis ut leo, morieris ut canis." "You mounted like a fox, you will reign like a lion, and you will die like a dog."

Another story, rejected by Muratori, is commonly quoted to prove the arrogance of Boniface. We are told

¹ F. Rocquain, *La Papauté au Moyen Age*, p. 231 f., Paris, 1881. Speaking himself of his character, he adds: "Head of the Church in a period of degeneration, he more than once indulged in the use of those lax principles which are the mark of an age of decay". . . He was "less a priest than a king", but still "more than once he displayed a nobility of character which it is impossible not to recognise".

² Gibbon in his false account of the death of Boniface quotes this as from "the chronicles of the times". *Decline*, etc., vii, p. 243, ed. Bury. The editor of the chronicle of N. Trivet, from whom "Rishanger" has largely borrowed, notes, however, that as T. "does not mention this, and the anecdote is at variance with the meekness of Celestine, while the violence of B. has been much exaggerated, we are inclined to think that the anecdote belongs to a much later age". P. 334, n., ed. E.H.S. But it was already quoted by Nogaret in 1304. See his words, ap. Dupuy, *Hist. du diff.*, p. 249.

how on Ash-Wednesday, Porchetto Spinola presented himself before Boniface to receive the ashes. Thereupon the Pope threw them in his face, with the words : "Remember thou art a Ghibelline, and with the Ghibellines thou wilt return to dust." ¹

"It is said," too, that "eager to be emperor he caused imperial regalia to be made for himself".² Of course he was not content merely to have them. The sensation-mongers describe how he wore them. When Albert, King of the Romans, after killing Adolf, sought recognition from Boniface, his ambassadors were received by the Pope sitting on his throne, clad in armour, girt with a sword, and wearing "the diadem of Constantine"! In rejecting their suit, he drew his sword, and exclaimed : "Am I not the Supreme Pontiff? Is not this the chair of Peter? Cannot I guard the rights of the Empire? I am Caesar, I am the Emperor!"³ On the same lines, and by the same Pipinus, Boniface "is said" (*fertur*) to have asked the envoys of the King of France from whom their master held his kingdom, and then to have told them that he must hold it either from him or from the Emperor.⁴ Equally by the same author, is he said "to have persuaded Celestine to resign",⁵ and when dying to have gnawed his arms like a dog.⁶ Then he quotes verses of a certain "master" against Boniface :—

¹ George Stella († observe 1420) in his *Ann. Genuen.*, l. ii, ap. *R. I. SS.*, vol. xvii, p. 1019. Muratori justly writes : "Hoc fabulam sapit" in *præfat.* to the *Chron. Gen.* of James de Varagine, ap. *R. I. SS.*, ix, p. 3.

² See a fragment of a *Chron.* of the lower Rhine, ap. Delisle, *Notices et extraits*, t. xxxv, p. 385.

³ So that lover of the marvellous, the Ghibelline Pipinus, *Chron.*, iv, c. 47, p. 745. Cf. p. 739. Ferreti, that other bitter Ghibelline opponent of Boniface, gives a similar story. With reason does Cipolla, the editor of the latter, call the story "la diceria accarezzata del partito ghibellino", i, p. 133, n.

⁴ *Chron.*, p. 739.

⁵ *Ib.*, iv, 41.

⁶ *Ib.*, p. 741.

“ To thee were given names, both good,
 Benedict erst, Boniface now.
 Do well, speak well, then blessed wert.
 Accursed ! Thou’st said and done but ill.”¹

Again : “ is he reported to have said ” — “ my predecessor worked miracles, but I will work wonders ”.² But none of these stories went far enough, and so an enemy annalist gravely chronicles : “ *many* say that he had a familiar spirit ” in a ring, and that he sacrificed his hair and nails to it.³

One would gladly here make an end of the narration of baseless fables ; but there is one more which we cannot pass over, as it is often cited as genuine even by serious historians, and is believed by some just because it is cited by Dante (*Inf.*, xxvii), and the two other special Ghibelline enemies of the Pope, Ferreti and Pipinus.⁴ Of the last two we need take no notice, as the source of their narratives is Dante.

In the eighth gulf of Hell, reserved for evil counsellors, where each flame contained a lost soul, the poet was addressed by one who proclaimed himself from Romagna :

“ Of the mountains there ”
 Was I, betwixt Urbino and the height
 Whence Tiber first unlocks his mighty flood.”

¹ *Ib.* Naturally Muratori, the editor of P., gives no credence to these calumnious fictions.

² So our Thos. de Burton, *Chron. monast. de Melsa*, ii, p. 242. He did not write till 1372–1400, or even later.

³ *Chron. Urbevet.*, ap. R. I. SS., xv, pt. v, p. 200, new ed. See this same author for further fables, p. 201. Paolino Pieri, *Cron. Fiorent.*, pp. 75–6, gives these and other “ diceasi ” or “ si dice ” one after the other. The story of the ring and the worship of devils is brought up against Boniface by Nogaret. Cf. *Hist. du diff.*, p. 332, etc.

⁴ F., *Chron.*, i, p. 72 ; Pipinus, ap. R. I. SS., ix, p. 741. The story is also found in *some* MSS. of Villani (viii, 23) ; but, even in the MSS. in which it occurs, the advice is not directly connected with the taking of Palestrina. Cf. Cipolla, note to Ferreti’s version of the story, i, p. 70 ff.

⁵ The mt. of Montefeltro.

At the poet's request :—

“ Now tell us, I entreat thee who thou art,”

the tortured soul made answer :—

“ A man of arms at first, I clothed me then
In good Saint Francis' girdle, hoping so
To have made amends. And certainly my hope
Had failed not, but that he, whom curses light on
The high priest, again seduced me into sin.”

Then, after much abuse of “ The chief of new Pharisees ”, who revered not “ his great charge nor sacred ministry ”, Guido went on to tell how Boniface, offering him absolution for anything he might suggest, bade him :

“ Teach me my purpose so to execute
That Penestrino cumber earth no more.”

This the Pope asked of the wily old soldier as his troops had been unable to capture Palestrina, the last stronghold of his enemies, the Colonnas. To him gave answer Guido :—

“ Large promise with performance scant, be sure,
Shall make thee triumph in thy lofty soul.”

On this advice, we are assured, Boniface acted, and thus obtained possession of the city.

In a note to Ferreti, who copied this dramatic story, Muratori, his editor, had long ago declared that “ no upright man ” would accept it ¹; and the editor of Cary's translation of Dante which we have here used, adds that it would seem that even Dante himself, when he wrote his *Convito*, had either not heard this story or at any rate had not believed it. In that work he wrote of Guido (iv, 28), as one of those noble spirits “ who when they approached the last haven, lowered the sails of

¹ R. I. SS., ix, p. 970.

their earthly operations, and gave themselves up to religion".¹

That Guido changed his mode of life and became a Franciscan to do penance for his sins is certain,² and we believe that, since the publication of the Chronicle of bro. John Elemosina (1336), which has supplied us with some details of the Franciscan life of "the ferocious count",³ the mythical nature of Guido's advice to Boniface is equally certain. The friar tells how this Count, who "is said to have fought thirty-two battles", and who was "the head and leader" of the rebels against the Church, threw himself at the feet of Pope Boniface, "that pure pastor of the Church," obtained absolution from him, was a little later (1296) received into the Order of St. Francis by the Minister-General John de Murro,⁴ and thereafter passed his time in prayer and in the performance of the humblest offices in the convent at Assisi. This he only left to go to the Holy Land; for he got the permission of his superiors to retire there to avoid the multitude of people who came to him for advice. But he died at Ancona on his way thither "about the time" of the death of S. Louis, Bishop of Toulouse, which took place Aug. 19, 1297.⁵ There can then, it would seem, be no doubt that no sinister or any other kind of advice was given by Count Guido of Montefeltro, become a humble Franciscan, to Pope Boniface VIII. Even if, as we shall see, the

¹ P. 60, ed. London, 1869, or Eng. trans. Temple Classics, p. 372. The *Convito* has been translated into English in the Temple Classics, 1924.

² Cf. *supra*, Vol. XVII, p. 309. Cf. the *Ann. Cæsen.*, which are exact in the matter of dates, and which say that G. became a Franciscan, Nov. 17, 1296, and died at Ancona, Sept. 29, 1298, ap. *R. I. SS.*, xiv, p. 1114.

³ By G. Golubovich, ap. vol. ii, p. 116 ff. of his *Biblioteca bio-bibliog.*

⁴ Cf. Potthast, 24373, July 23, 1296.

⁵ G. G., pp. 128-9. Cf. Golubovich himself on Guido and his supposed advice, *ib.*, p. 483 ff. From the *Annals of Cesena*, ap. *R. I. SS.*, xiv, p. 1114, it appears that the actual date of his death was Sept. 29, 1298.

story of the siege of Palestrina did not show that there was no need of false promises to take the place, it is impossible to believe that our friar would have said that Guido had obtained permission to leave Italy in order not to be compelled to act against his conscience, or to give bad advice, if he had talked to Boniface in the manner related by Dante.¹

Though it may be said with truth that many writers have formed their bad opinion of the character of Boniface VIII. solely from these and other similar figments of hostile imaginations, it must not be supposed that there are no other grounds for forming a low estimate of his character. Boniface had many enemies. Not a few people instinctively hate public men of superior intelligence and strong will, like Boniface VIII., who talk and act imperiously, as such characters are easily inclined to do. Then the Celestine Order was opposed to him for having, at least, approved of the abdication of Celestine V., and for having subsequently confined him. Some of the Franciscans and Dominicans were hostile to him, because though he was favourable to them in general, he put reasonable restrictions on some of their actions.² Especially were the "Spirituals" of the Franciscans opposed to him, i.e., those to whom Celestine had granted permission to leave the Franciscan Order, and to form a congregation apart, after giving them the name of the brothers or poor hermits of Pope Celestine.³

The character of Boniface told by his enemies.

His enemies.

The Celestines.

Some of the Friars.

¹ "Cum ipsæ dare nollet consilia non bona, et amicos turbare nollet antiquos . . . deliberavit cito . . . ad Terram sanctam transfretare." John E., ap. G. G., ii, 129. See on this "Guido" story C. Cipolla, "Sulle tradizioni anti-bonifaciane rispetto a Guido da Montefeltro e alla guerra del Colonna," ap. *Atti della R. Accademia delle Scienze di Torino*, vol. xlix, 1913-14.

² Cf. his bull "Super cathedram" of Feb. 18, 1300, ap. Wadding, *Ann.*, v, 540. Recalled by the Dominican Pope Benedict XI., it was reaffirmed by Clement V. at the Council of Vienne.

³ Cf. *supra*, Vol. XVII, p. 314.

The "poor
hermits".

We have seen how Boniface was disposed to spare that particular body ; but had to condemn other companies of monks or friars who were conceived to be connected with them. Nay, according to John XXII., the " Poor Hermits " themselves were condemned by him, indirectly at least. Boniface revoked all the acts of Celestine except such as he himself might approve, and, adds Pope John, " it does not appear that their privilege (i.e., that of the Poor Hermits) was approved." ¹ Indeed, according to Angelo Clareno, one of their leaders, Boniface condemned the Poor Hermits directly. He had been told by their enemies, who may or may not have known the truth, and by others, who in ignorance confused them with heretical sects or with religious who were either through wilfulness or want of knowledge in rebellion against him, that the Hermits spread about everywhere " that he was no true Pope, and that the Church had no authority and the like ". Deceived by their falsehoods, he ordered proceedings to be taken against the Hermits.²

The withdrawal of this privilege made the Spirituals, or Rigorists generally, very irritated ; and some of them began to go to extremes. Among them was that mystic dreamer, Ubertino da Casale, a pupil of John Olivi († 1298, a much sounder man than his disciple), and a man who, in his mystical imaginings, believed that our Lord caused him to experience the different states of

¹ Among the " extravagantes " of John XXII. see tit. vii, cap. UN. " Sancta Romana," ap. *Corpus juris canon.*, ii, p. 1213. That John refers to these hermits is clear because he speaks of those who professed to observe the rule of St. Francis " to the letter ", but who, putting forward a privilege of Pope Celestine V., did not subject themselves to the Ministers of the Order.

² *Hist. trib.*, p. 316, ed. Ehrle. " Tanto viro falsitates coram ponere non timentes, dixerunt : ' Domine, p. pater hæretici . . . sunt hii . . . et in tota terra illa . . . disseminant quod vos non estis papa,' " etc. Evidently A. Clareno had a good opinion of Boniface.

soul of the various beings who had come in contact with Him whilst on earth—even those of the ox and ass whose breath warmed Him in the stable of Bethlehem! He was also just as ready to believe that he was directly inspired by God as that he was the worst of sinners.¹ Under the inspiration of this misguided, not to say insolent, fanatic, many of the Spirituals denied the legitimacy of the resignation of Celestine, and hence affirmed that Boniface was not a true Pope, and inveighed bitterly against him for persecuting “those holy men who observed the rule and most holy testament of St. Francis, aye, the very Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ”, and for blasphemously destroying the bull of the lord Pope Celestine.²

Many even of the sounder men among the Spirituals The
Spirituals. disliked Boniface not only on account of his lordly ways and his magnificence, but particularly because they saw in him the great obstacle to the development of *Joachism*. They saw how he had deposed Raymond Gaufredi from the Generalship of the Order for his *Joachite* tendencies,³ and realized that in him they were up against one who would assuredly not do anything to promote that reign of the Holy Spirit and of the monks to which they were fanatically looking forward. This expectation of the

¹ On U. da C., see the interesting work *Étude sur U. de C.* of F. Callaey. By name, Boniface chiefly condemned the “Bizochi”. Cf. *supra*, Vol. XVII, p. 315, his bull “Incrementum”, of May 7, 1297, ap. Potthast, 24, 510, and *Jordani* (Paulinus Min.), *Chron.*, ap. Muratori, *Antiq.*, iv, p. 1020.

² Boniface was attacked “in persecutione quam fecit illis sanctis viris, etc. Nam bullam d. Cœlestini predicta sanctissima continentem destruere et blasphemare et aperire os suum in blasphemias ad Deum sanctum”. Quoted by F. C., p. 128, from the *Arbor Vitæ*, lib. v, c. 8.

³ Cf. *Chron. XXIV. Gen.*, pp. 451, 457–8; Barthol. de Pisa, *Lib. de conformitate, Fruct.* ix, vol. i, p. 440. On the fanatical support given to Joachism by the Spirituals, see that excellent book *Gioachinismo e Francescanismo nel Dugento*, P. G. Bondatti, S. Maria degli Angeli, 1924.

speedy advent of the "Eternal Gospel" was a bond between the Spirituals, both those who were still within the ordered ranks of the Friars Minor and those who had separated themselves from them, and a variety of heretical or schismatical sects who paraded under the banner of St. Francis or of "Poverty". Another point in which many of these undisciplined "religicus" agreed was in the ignoring of the fact that the beginning and end of the Rule of St. Francis insisted on obedience to the Roman Pontiff,¹ and that the first duty of any kind of religious was submission to their superiors.²

Poets.

Boniface had also the misfortune to have as enemies some of the greatest poets of the day. The most powerful of these enemies was the immortal Florentine, Dante. He hated the Pope with the whole of his fiery soul. He was a "Ghibelline of the Ghibellines", and an ardent supporter of the *White* faction (the Bianchi) in Florence. Boniface was a Guelf, and what was worse in the eyes of Dante, he supported the triumphant *Black* faction (the Neri) in the poet's native city. With his vivid imagination, Dante could not love or hate by halves; and, as he regarded Boniface as ultimately responsible for his

¹ See the "Expositio regulæ Fratrum Minorum", as written, 1321-6, even by the Spiritual Angelo Clareno. Cf. cap. 12, where he says that the beginning and end of the Rule are in agreement. Both prescribe obedience to the lord Pope Honorius and his successors. The Friars are to be "members under his head"—"tamquam sui capitis membra cum ipso et sub ipso facere intelliguntur ex debito." A. C., p. 229, ed. Olier, Quaracchi, 1912, or ap. C. da Pesaro, *Il Clareno*, p. xxv.

² Hence the successor of Boniface, Pope Benedict XI. in his *Commentary on S. Matthew* (chap. v), of which Fietta (vol. ii) has given a very full analysis, condemns even Joachim himself as well as all those heretics who were looking for a new law of the Holy Ghost. "Nè sono da ascoltare Gioachino ed altri eretici che aspettano una terza legge vegnente dallo Spirito Sancto, che scioglierà gli uomini dalla legge vecchia e dalla evangelica ad ogni lor voglia," p. 101, n. 17.

banishment, he hated him accordingly. Apart from doubtful allusions, there are said to be at least ten passages in the *Commedia* in which the poet attacked Boniface.¹

Another poet who did much harm to the good name of Boniface was the unbalanced author of the *Stabat Mater*, Jacopone da Todi, of whom we have already spoken.

Lastly among the enemies of Boniface we may mention those historians who were ardently Ghibelline, national, or under the influence of the Colonnas. Ghibelline historians.

We may begin our picture of Boniface, as limned by Dante. his enemies, by quotations from Dante and the poets whose unrestrained language has done more harm to his reputation than the words of any other class of writers. Dante first introduces Boniface to us in Hell, being addressed by Nicholas III. who, in the same impudent way, is depicted by the poet as in the same dread abode. Nicholas thus upbraids him :—

“ So early dost thou surfeit with the wealth
For which thou fearedst not in guile to take
The lovely lady (the Church), and then mangle her.”

Passing over the denunciations against the unfortunate Pontiff which Dante puts into the mouths of Guido da Montefeltro and St. Bonaventure,³ we will conclude our citations with the terrible words with which St. Peter is made to denounce him : With face on fire with holy anger, the chief of the Apostles bursts out :—

¹ Cf. Casartelli, *The Popes in the Divina Commedia*, p. 52. It is Benvenuto da Imola who calls Dante a “ G. of the G.” on the authority of his master Boccaccio : He says that D. was a Guelf originally, but after his expulsion from Florence : “ factus est Ghibelinus imo Ghibelinissimus, sicut aperte scribit Boccacius.” *Comment. Inf.*, ix, vol. i, p. 339, ed. Lacaita.

² *Inf.*, xix, 57 ff.

³ *Inf.*, xxvii, and *Par.*, xii, 86–90.

“ Wonder not if my hue
 Be changed ; for, while I speak, these shalt thou see
 All in like manner change with me. My place
 He who usurps on earth (my place, ay, mine,
 Which in the presence of the Son of God
 Is void) the same hath made my cemetery
 A common sewer of puddle and of blood.
 The more below his triumph who from hence
 Malignant fell.”¹

Dante's fourteenth century commentator, Benvenuto da Imola, naturally follows his hero's lead, but with less bitterness and with more open mind. To him Boniface was at any rate “ a great soul ” (*magnus animo*), though “ more lordly than became priest ”. He was also “ a lover of honour and of the high position of the Church . . . declaring that for its exaltation all was lawful. . . . Very fond of money, he greatly exalted his kith and kin ”. He was at any rate “ magnificent . . . the first who lived imperially ”.²

Jacopone.

In the same year in which, as we shall see, the Colonnas issued at Lunghezza their virulent manifesto against Boniface (1297), one of its signatories, the frenzied Spiritual, Jacopone da Todi, put forth his “ violent satire ”,³ beginning : “ O papa Bonifatio mult' aj jocato al monno.”⁴ It accuses the Pope of avarice, nepotism, simony, neglect

¹ *Par.*, xxvii, 17 ff.

² Benvenuto († 1391), *Infer.*, xix, vol. ii, p. 43 f., 262, 317, ed. Lacaita.

³ So is it described by G. M. Monti in his paper on the poem, ap. *Miscellanea F. Ehrle*, vol. iii, pp. 67-87, Rome, 1924.

⁴ Ap. B. Brugnoli, *Le Satire di J.*, p. 304 ff., Florence, 1914. Pacheu, *J. de Todi*, Paris, 1914, gives the original with a French translation, p. 314 ff. Sedgwick, *Italy in the Thirteenth Century*, ii, p. 317, has given an English version of 3 out of the 26 stanzas. We repeat them in the text, as they are sufficient to give an idea of the original doggerel. The authenticity of the satire has been attacked, and, if published in 1297, then certainly the verses alluding to the outrage of 1303 have been interpolated. Cf. G. Calisti, “ L'attentato di Anagni, e una laude de J. di T.” in *Nuova Antologia*, 1922.

of his spiritual duties, and of a wish to rule the world. He is the worst of the Popes, he even held dances in Holy Week, and by charms tried to prolong his life :—

“ O Pope Boniface !
 You've had a merry day.
 But, when you go away,
 It won't be with a jolly face.

It seems that you have shameless been,
 Yes, flung all shame aside,
 And all your soul applied
 To elevate your kith and kin.

O avarice, still worse than pride,
 A thirst most multifold,
 To drink a monstrous mass of gold,
 And still be quite unsatisfied ! ” ¹

Another poet, who, because he was a Ghibelline and a White, attacked Boniface, was Dante's elder contemporary and “ first of his friends ”, Guido Cavalcanti, like Dante an exile from his native Florence. After Boniface had laid an interdict on that city, and when some of the great Houses were leaving the city, Guido attacked the Pope in a poem beginning :—

“ Nero ! Thus much for tidings in thine ear.”

To quote a verse or two :—

“ Oh ! in what monstrous sin dost thou engage,
 All these which are of loftiest blood to drive
 Away, that none dare pause, but all take wing !
 Yet sooth it is, thou might'st redeem the pledge
 Even yet, and save thy naked soul alive,
 Wert thou but patient in the bargaining.” ²

¹ Cf. Ozanam and his just condemnation of such language, ap. *The Franciscan Poets*, p. 216.

² Trans. of D. G. Rossetti, *Dante and his Circle*, p. 165, London, 1874.

Hostile
historians.

The vindictive effusions against Boniface of inimical poets were matched by the bitter diatribes of hostile historians.

Taking these last at random, we may begin with the author of the *Chronicle of Orvieto*. Its author, after praising the prudence of Boniface in worldly matters and his courage that feared no man, goes on to say that he was so clever that he got the better of anybody, and despised everyone. No cardinal dared resist him. He amassed money and established his relatives in the Campagna. The chronicler, in this apparently standing alone, even declared that he was "a man of evil life and reputation before he became Pope".¹

The Ghibelline Pipinus describes him as "the most crafty (callidissimus) of all men, and, by long experience and close application, subtle (vafer) in all his actions. He sought too eagerly for gold".²

Dino Compagni,³ of the White Florentine faction, tells us that Boniface was a man of great daring and consummate ability, who guided the Church as he pleased, and humbled those who did not submit to him. Consequently

¹ *Chron. Urbevet.*, p. 200. As a concrete case he says that Boniface gave his nephew Benedict the "comitatum Hildibrandiscum" which had come into the hands of the Roman Church, but that when Boniface was seized at Anagni the people of Orvieto drove his nephew out of the country. Cf. *Mart. Pol. contin. Ang.*, ap. *M. G. SS.*, xxx, p. 715: "Cujus gloria fuit hominem verbis confundere, ut fertur." See also *ib. contin. Brabant*, ap. *ib.*, xxiv, 261. "Audax homo et potenter pontificans . . . satis carnalis circa suos fuit." He gave them such riches that they became equal to the greatest men in Rome and in the Campagna, which provoked the jealousy of the nobles. The Chronicler adds that his family were so ennobled and enriched that they survive "to this day". The writer was then evidently not a contemporary.

² *Ap. R. I. SS.*, ix., lib. iv, c, 41, p. 737.

³ Supposing his *Chronicle* authentic. Contrast Balzani, *Early Chronicles of Italy*, p. 317, with J. A. Symonds, *Renaissance in Italy*, 207 ff., ed. 1897. Dino, ii, 2, accuses Boniface of wishing "to cast down the Whites, and exalt the Blacks".

many (Whites and Ghibellines) rejoiced at his death, "because his rule was harsh, and he stirred up wars, undoing many people, and gathering much treasure."¹

Finally, as Boniface came into collision with the Sicilians, one is not surprised that their historian Specialis, while acknowledging that Boniface was "circumspect in worldly affairs", describes him as an "astute and crafty man".² Later, when the story of the quarrel between Boniface and Philip the Fair has to be told, the reader will find many other outrageous accusations, even of heresy³ and idolatry, brought against the Pope by his enemies. We may now see what authors, more or Villani. less impartial, but not always, from reasons of distance, etc., too well informed, have to say about Boniface. First let us hear the famous Florentine historian, Villani, too much perhaps under the influence of Dante to be altogether unbiassed when speaking of Boniface, and, at times, too far away to be able always to know the truth. Pope Boniface, he says, "was very wise both in learning and in natural wit, and a man very cautious and experienced and of great knowledge and memory."⁴ Very haughty he was, and proud, and cruel towards his enemies and adversaries, and was of great heart (*di gran cuore*),⁵ and much feared by all the people, and he exalted and increased greatly the estate and the rights of the

¹ i, 21, and ii, 35.

² Nic. Specialis, *Hist. Sic.*, ii, 20.

³ A charge which another king, James II. of Aragon, who "knew and saw" "the most holy Father in Christ, the lord Pope Boniface of worthy (*recolendæ*) memory" regarded as "incredible and horrible". See his letter to Clement V., ap. Finke, *Mon. Arag.*, p. 150.

⁴ Both friend and foe alike praise these qualities in Boniface, so that we shall make no reference to them.

⁵ And so a modern writer has, we believe, said well: "B. was not a sage nor a saint, but he was a great soul." Cochin, *Jubilés d'Italie*, p. 89, Paris, 1911.

Church.”¹ In another place he said of him²: “A man of large schemes was he, and lordly, and sought for much honour. He well knew how to maintain and advance the rights of the Church, and by reason of his knowledge and power he was much redoubted and feared. He was very rich through making the Church great and his kinsfolk; and he made no scruple of gain, for he said that all was lawfully his which was the Church’s.”

Some of these traits of character are also affirmed by B. Guidonis and others. Bernard asserts that Boniface “began in quite a unique way to swell his power and papal magnificence”.³ He also accuses the Pope of being too fond of gold, and of seeking to be feared rather than loved; for, as all the writers of his age say, “he was of lofty soul.”⁴ The frequently repeated assertions that Boniface had a love of power, receive some support from a story reported by a chronicler. When the see of Reggio-Emilia became vacant by the death of bishop William (1301), a Franciscan was elected as his successor. But neither the Minister-General nor the Pope would approve of the choice. Accordingly at a secret consistory (Apr. 3, 1302), Richard of Siena, cardinal-deacon of S. Eustachio, proposed Dr. Henry of Casolucci for the see. Many cardinals and the Pope at once accepted the nomination, because he was known to them as the author of a

¹ *Chron.*, viii, c. 64. Cf. *ib.*, c. 62, where he tells how B. “was daring in doing great things, and was a man of lofty aspirations (magnanimo)”. We have generally availed ourselves of Selfe’s trans.

² *Chron.*, viii, 6.

³ Ap. *R. I. SS.*, ii, pt. i, p. 670. Ptolemy of Lucca, *H.E.* xxiv, c. 36, speaks to the same effect, as does the author of the *Præclara Francorum gesta*. See p. 397 of Guizot’s in the *Collection des Mémoires*, p. 397. But these authors have a common source.

⁴ “Corde magnanimus,” *l.c.*, p. 672. Cf. Paolino Pieri, *Chron.*, p. 75, and *Ann. Rotomag.*, ap. *M. G. SS.*, xxvi, p. 504. “Vir utique magnanimus.” Hence even Tosti allows that his loftiness was “almost pride”. P. 79.

book in which he essayed to prove that "throughout the whole world the Pope was lord both in all things spiritual and temporal". The enterprising doctor was duly proclaimed bishop on Apr. 30.¹

Many of the accusations which we have seen levelled at Pope Boniface were beyond doubt founded on nothing better than gossip or malice; for, as a contemporary monk of Fürstenfeld, commonly known as Volcmar, pointed out: "Pope Boniface, on account of his uprightness (*probitatem suam*) by which he excelled the rest of men, had many who were jealous of him."² Let us then give ear to what some who were not envious of Boniface had to say of him, and let us take notice at the same time that high praise was given to him by men who were in the strictest sense contemporary, men of high position, and who, like Stefaneschi, knew him intimately.³

Con-
temporary
praise of
Boniface.

We have seen with what indignation King James II. of Aragon who knew him rebutted the charge of heresy that was brought against him by the unscrupulous agents of Philip of France. Not content, however, with saying what he was not, James thanked God for bringing about the election to the Papacy of so useful and worthy a man as cardinal Gætani, whose discretion and industry the King thought might be relied on to improve and pacify the world.⁴

Of all the contemporary princes of Boniface, the noblest was our own King Edward I. At any rate, Boniface himself boldly proclaimed that he was "of all the Princes

¹ Alb. Miliolus, *Chron. addit.*, ap. *M. G. SS.*, xxxi, pp. 667-8. Cf. *Mem. Potest. Reg.*, ap. *R. I. SS.*, viii, p. 1180.

² *Chron. de Gest. Principum*, ap. Böhmer, *Fontes*, i, 24.

³ Stefaneschi, *Coron. Bonif.*, c. 3, p. 89, ed. Seppelt, like all other writers, whether his friends or enemies, praises the intelligence and wisdom of Boniface.

"Fuit mens alta viro, facunda juvenus et docile ingenium, solers astutia, etc." His wisdom was a veritable lighthouse to bishops.

⁴ Ep. to his people, of Jan. 23, 1295, ap. Finke, *Mon. Aragón.*, i, p. 23.

of the world the best", and on his side Edward had the highest opinion of the Pope, and honoured him when he was only a notary, as well as when he became cardinal and Pope.¹ In fact, we have the assurance of an historian, strictly contemporary with Boniface, that that "most prudent, vigorous, and literary" Pontiff "was thought most highly of by Christian men generally".² Though, if we are to accept the judgment of our annalist of Lanercost, men's thoughts of him sprang rather from fear than love. He was a man "whom all men feared as a lion because of his wisdom and courage".³

It is noteworthy that the German chroniclers who, as Boniface had no quarrel with their country, were more likely to be impartial, often speak eulogistically of him. Among others the Chronicler of Erfurt wrote that Boniface "was in every way praiseworthy, and a man of remarkable skill".⁴

Augustinus
Triumphus.

Dealing with the career of Pope Boniface as a whole, one of his partizans, seemingly Augustinus Triumphus,⁵ in a tract published to defend and praise him, tells us that he had three ends in view.

The first was the promotion, whenever they were made known to him, of good men whom he ever loved. He raised

¹ "Et apres auxint nous ad il mult honoreez en chesqun estat que nous avons eu, et in estat de notaire, et apres en estat de cardinale, puis apres en estat de pape." See the document of 1300, printed by Black in the *Eng. Hist. Rev.*, 1902, p. 520.

² Gilles le Muisit, a monk of a noble family of Tournay, who was present at the great jubilee in Rome (1300). He was born c. 1271 and died 1352. *Chron.*, p. 48, ed. H. Lemaître, Paris, 1905. "Fuitque de eo fama ingens inter Christianos."

³ P. 175.

⁴ *Chron. Erford. mod.*, p. 322, ed. Holder-Egger. Cf. Ricobaldi of Ferrara, also a contemporary. B. was "vir prudens in negotiis agendis". *Hist. Pont.*, ap. *R. I. SS.*, ix, p. 182. He has not a word to say against B. John Elemosina describes him as "discretus et prudens". Ap. Golubovich, *l.c.*, ii, 127.

⁵ So says, p. 519, Scholz, *Publizistik zur zeit Philipps den Schönen*.

the poor ones among them by giving them money, and the rich ones by imparting to them knowledge and virtue, so that all then might sit with the princes of the earth. In the second place he ever strove to put down the haughty and tyrannical, because, as Judith said (ix, 16), from the beginning the proud were not acceptable to him, but the prayer of the humble and the meek ever pleased him. His third aim was to promote the reign of truth and justice; for wherever there was obscurity in the law and in what appertained to the forms of law and the instruction of the whole Christian people, there he introduced light and order. If then an effort is being made to secure the canonization of Celestine, his predecessor,¹ with much greater reason should the canonization of Boniface be sought. In the first case petitions are presented for the canonization of a man who worked merely for his own soul, and died in his simplicity; but, in the case of the latter, there is question of a man who worked for his own soul, and for that of others, and died for the freedom of the Church. Nay, Boniface ought to be regarded by the faithful not only as a confessor because he laboured for the advancement of the good men, for the humbling of the proud, and for the development of truth and learning, but also as a martyr, because he was seized by the enemies of the Church, covered with insult and injury, and finally died for justice, and for the preservation of ecclesiastical liberty.²

¹ This shows that the author was writing before the canonization of C.

² See his *Tractatus*, ap. Finke, *Aus dem T.*, p. lxxxiv f. The praise of A. T. is supported by that of the well-known author of the *Golden Legend*, James de Varagine, archbishop of Genoa, most strictly a contemporary. B. was "virtutis magnæ scientiæ et experientiæ", *Chron. Jan.*, ap. *R. I. SS.*, ix, p. 54. Stefaneschi too also confirms Augustinus in what he says about Boniface's attacks on the proud:

"Vincetque malos, subdetque superbos."

Coron. Bonif., c. 15, p. 109.

The illustrious Augustinian who penned these spirited words was a pupil of St. Thomas Aquinas, and died in 1328, in his eighty-fifth year after a most distinguished career. He had been in the service of the Popes since the days of Gregory X., and if he was an enthusiastic champion of the rights of the Church, he is much more worthy of a deferential hearing from us when speaking for Boniface than any of those we have quoted when besmirching him.

Liber
Sextus
Decretalium.

Recalling the fact that even the contemporary illustrated satirical production, the *Initia Malorum* which we have frequently quoted, has a good word for Boniface, calling him "the destroyer of hypocrites",¹ we may here conveniently enumerate some of the acts of Boniface which illustrate various traits of his character.

That section of the Body of Canon Law, known as the *Liber Sextus Decretalium*, is a standing proof that Boniface was learned, and was "a most profound jurist".² "Among other good things," says a chronicler, "which he did for the Church of God for which he had a great love" was the publication of his "Sixth book of Decretals".³ His contemporaries had the highest opinion of it. According to Villani, Boniface commissioned M. Guglielmo da Bergamo and M. Ricciardi of Siena,

¹ Ap. Pipinus, *R. I. SS.*, ix, p. 741. The illustration showed B. in the great mantle, wearing a mitre. Behind his face were depicted two heads with long hair wearing crowns, while a cow standing on its hind legs is represented gnawing the Pope's shoulder. The later cartoon, which was put out as the work of the Abbot Joachim, shows B. spearing the dove of peace, with the Gallic cock crowing in front of him, an eagle pecking at his hand, and a monk (the ex-Pope Celestine) sitting on the ground beside him. It bears the inscription about his fraudulent entry, etc. The copy of this cartoon, given by Thurston, *The Holy Year of Jubilee*, p. 9, is slightly different from the one in the *Vaticinia Alb. Joachimi*, Venice, 1600.

² "Jurista permaximus." *Chron. S. Bertin.*, ap. *M. G. SS.*, xxv, p. 866.

³ *M. Pol. cont. Brabant.*, ap. *ib.*, p. 261.

who were cardinals, and M. Dino Rosoni of Mugello, "all of them supreme masters in laws and decretals, together with himself (for he too was a great master in divinity and in decretals), to draw up the Sixth book of Decretals which is, as it were, the light of all the laws and the decretals."¹ It embodied the decrees of the Popes issued since the publication of the decretals of Gregory IX., as well as decisions of his own "which solved all the questions found in the ordinary glosses".² It cleared up many obscure points, and, adds Matthew of Neuburg, "by its clearness and elegance of diction" shows "that Boniface surpassed all who had ever written on law".³

With a fine letter of March 3, 1298, the Pope sent it "to all the doctors and scholars of the University of Bologna" to be studied there. "Presiding," wrote the Pope, "over the Holy Roman Church which the inscrutable height of divine Providence has by its unchangeable disposition set over all the Churches, wishing it to hold the chief magistracy (magistratum) of the whole world, we are drawn and urged by our continual cares, and assiduous meditation to devote ourselves, as far as strength has been given us from above, with constant anxious zeal, to the advantage of our subjects whose prosperity is ours. For their tranquillity have we voluntarily embraced toil, and oft passed sleepless nights in order to remove scandal from them, and, as far as we can, now by the assertion of old laws, and now by the issue of new ones, to repress those contentions which human nature, ever striving to put forth new forms, daily renews." He goes on to explain that, since he became Pope, he has been incessantly urged to put in order the decrees of his predecessors. This he has done with the aid of

¹ *Chron.*, viii, 64.

² Ptolemy of Lucca, *Annales*, ap. *R. I. SS.*, xi, p. 1303.

³ *Chron.*, ap. Böhmer, *Fontes*, iv, p. 171.

William, archbishop of Embrun, Berenger, bishop of Bourges, and Richard of Siena, vice-chancellor of the Roman Church. Finally the University is informed that the new volume of laws is, in future, to be the only one regarded as authentic, and is to be received and commented on as such.¹

Boniface as
judge and
lawmaker.

It is, no doubt, one thing for a ruler to make a good compilation of existing laws, and to issue a well-arranged code, but it is quite another for him to publish just and useful decrees himself. It would appear that Boniface could do both. Among his decrees, we may signalize one which was particularly considerate and merciful. He decreed that women were not to be forced, either by apostolic letters or by those of legates, to appear against their will to give evidence personally in a court of law.²

Although, too, his attention had been called to an outrage that certain Jews were said to have committed in the matter of some consecrated hosts,³ he nevertheless decreed that, in general, the Jews had a right to know the names of their accusers. Boniface noted that, in the case of charges brought against the powerful, the names of their accusers had often to be concealed for the sake of their safety, still the Jews, despite the fact that "they were very wealthy", were, he said, to be accounted among the weak and impotent. Accordingly, Inquisitors were normally, in their case, to let them know who those were who brought charges against them.⁴

¹ Ap. *Corpus J.C.*, vol. ii, p. 933 f., ed. Friedburg. Cf. the bull of Sept. 23, 1298, to the University of Salamanca, in which he expresses a hope that his new code will lead to the quicker dispatch of legal cases. Ap. La Fuente, *Hist. ecles. de España*, iv, p. 572.

² *Reg.*, Apr. 8, 1295, n. 774. This decree was inserted in the *Sext. Decretal.* Cf. n. 773.

³ Potthast, n. 24139.

⁴ "Etiamsi divitiis habundetis." *Reg.*, n. 3063. Some may not think that his freeing clerics from all tolls was so obviously just. Cf. Déprez, *Recueil des docs. pontif.*, n. 19, p. 44.

Despite his bad health, Boniface would appear to have exercised his office as supreme judge in the Church with considerable regularity. Spiapasto, the procurator of the Commune of Vicenza, whom we have often quoted, tells in the driest manner when and where he held his judicial "audiences" (*audiencia*)—at the Lateran, at St. Peter's, at Anagni, etc., and when and why the various "audiences"—the "greater" and the "lesser" and the "audience of contradictory letters" were suspended. Once or twice he notes an interesting fact like the depriving the Colonnas of the "red hat—*capello rubro privavit*", and the earthquake of 1298, but he is mostly concerned with the Pope's judicial proceedings.¹

But Boniface was not only learned himself, he was a broad-minded lover of learning. He did not, like so many scholars, hug his learning to his own bosom. He was anxious that learning should be diffused. His action in this respect is a striking commentary on the following assertion of an historian of our English Universities, Mr. E. V. A. Huber. "In spite," he says, "of national diversities, there existed all over Europe (in the Middle Ages) a striking unity of spirit, of civilization, of learning, and of religious feeling, diffused mainly by the Church, which from her centre at Rome acted as the mainspring of mental culture everywhere, and penetrated into the internal constitution of all the nations beneath her sway."²

Boniface, at any rate, did much to diffuse learning. He began by strengthening it at the centre of Christendom. He established, for all the faculties, the Roman University which, though it has passed through many vicissitudes and achieved no great success, except seemingly in

Boniface a
founder of
Universities.

The
University
of (1) Rome.

¹ *Cronaca Rom.*, ap. *Archivio Veneto*, t. xvii (1887), p. 427 ff.

² *The English Universities*, vol. i, p. 1 f., London, 1843.

medicine,¹ exists to this day. Only a few months before his tragic death, Boniface issued his bull "In supreme preheminentia" (Apr. 3, 1303), by which he founded a *studium generale* in Rome. It was, he said, his business as Pastor of the Lord's flock to see to its advantage everywhere. But he had the special care of Rome as God had made it "the head of the world" and had there established more particularly the seat of his apostolate, and the foundations of the Church. It was therefore right "that the city to which God had given so many good gifts should become famous for learning, so as to produce men illustrious for the depth of their wisdom, adorned with virtue, and instructed in every science, and so as to become an abundant source of knowledge from whose copiousness all could draw who were athirst for learning". Accordingly, after consultation with his brethren, he decreed that henceforth and for ever, a *studium generale* should flourish in its midst, and that its doctors and students should enjoy the privileges granted to them at other Universities. Among other local privileges which he conceded to them were that they were not to be subject to the municipal jurisdiction of the Capitol except for murder, that they were to be free from rates and tolls, that the houses in which they lived should have their pensions fixed by special valuers, and that cases against or among themselves should be tried by rectors chosen by themselves.² A little later he appointed the abbot of St. Lawrence outside the walls and others to watch over the preservation of the privileges

¹ Cf. Walsh, *The Popes and Science*, p. 222. He says that the medical school of Rome "had during nearly two centuries some of the most distinguished professors of medicine in its ranks, and boasts among its faculty some of the greatest discoverers in the medical sciences, and especially in anatomy".

² *Reg.*, n. 5190.

he had granted the University.¹ This foundation of Boniface for the city of Rome must not be confused with that of the University of the *Court* of Rome, founded by Innocent IV. in 1244-5 ; though it appears that, in the days of Leo X., the two were combined, and the " Roman University established in a building since known as the Sapienza ".² According to Gregorovius,³ " the foundation of this institution," which, he adds, was maintained by the commune of Rome from the rents of Tivoli and Rispanpano, "graces the memory of Boniface with lasting renown."

Avignon also owed its University to Boniface. By a (2) Avignon. bull,⁴ even more finely conceived than that by which the University of Rome was founded, Boniface amplified the School of Law already there existing, and erected it into a University "for Canon and Civil Law, Medicine, and the liberal Arts ". The Pope thus begins his bull which, but for want of space, we would have given in its entirety. " The immense goodness of the Maker of all things decreed that uncultured man who, after eating the death-dealing fruit, could, by his natural powers, scarce rise to the perfection of reason (ad perfectionem discretionis), should be trained by science and art, and for this reason divinely granted that the different races of men, speaking various languages, should by means of Latin literature be enabled to hold intercourse with one another." Therefore in that language have historical facts been recorded, laws been classified, the principles of the sciences developed, and anthems been composed, so that we may be able to praise

¹ Ep. of June 6, 1303, *ib.* n. 5255. Cf. *Regesti di bandi*, i, p. 1, n. 2, and p. 2, n. 5, Rome, 1920, and F. M. Renazzi, *Storia dell' Università di Roma*, lib. i, c. 3, Rome, 1803.

² Rashdall, *Universities of Europe*, ii, p. 39.

³ *Rome*, vol. v, p. 619.

⁴ *Reg.*, n. 5256, July 1, 1303.

God in song, to understand the causes of things, to render justice to all, and to know the story of mankind. Therefore is it of importance to have everywhere men distinguished for learning and virtue, so that the people instructed by them may live in glory and peace. "For knowledge has incomparable stores of pleasure, and scatters broadcast the largess of every kind of good. We, therefore, by the pastoral office which God has given us, being bound to have a care for the public good, are most powerfully urged to strive that the study of letters may grow everywhere, but especially in those parts which are recognized to be particularly fit for multiplying the seeds of knowledge and rendering them fertile." Accordingly, as the city of Avignon, on account of the number of advantages which it possesses, is regarded as a suitable spot for the cultivation of letters, we hereby decree that there shall in future be in that city a University of studies (*studium generale*), and that its students who have there obtained their doctor's degree in canon and civil law, in medicine and the liberal arts shall enjoy the right of being recognized everywhere as qualified teachers, shall enjoy, that is, the right *ubique docendi*. The bull gives the bishop of Avignon supreme authority over the University. Rashdall, who unfortunately does not cite any portion of this splendid bull which is such a revelation of the soul of Boniface, tells us that the first statutes of the University were issued by bishop Aymin in 1303, that John XXIII. added a Faculty of Theology to the existing Faculties (1413), and that student movements to obtain a share in the government of the *Studium* were crushed by Urban V. (1367), Gregory XI. (1376), and Boniface IX. (1393).¹

Fermo. The ardent zeal of Boniface for the spread of learning induced him to listen to the prayers of the people of

¹ *L.c.*, p. 172 f.

Fermo (a city of the ever-trouble-giving Romagna) offered to him in their own behalf and in that of the neighbouring districts. Because, said the Pope, the air of the city of Fermo was good, and provisions were there abundant, he hearkened to the petition of its citizens, and therein instituted a University in which every "lawful Faculty" might be established, as at the University of Bologna.¹

This joint scheme of the Pope and the citizens of Fermo does not appear to have come to anything, and this key-city of the Marches remained always better known in the annals of war than in the roll of learning. That is perhaps the reason why its *studium* appears to have escaped the notice of Rashdall, as does also that of Pamiers.

As we shall have occasion to mention again later, (4) Pamiers. Boniface made the town of Pamiers in the county of Foix into a city, Bernard Saisset, the abbot of St. Antoninus therein, its bishop, and the monastic church its cathedral.² Then, after recounting that he had thus "decorated Pamiers with the title of a city", he decided that, because on account of the great many "commodities" which it possessed, it was a suitable place for a studium, it was advisable, in the public interest, that "men devoted to learning" should inhabit it. He accordingly decreed "by the authority of these presents", that henceforth there should be in the new city a *studium generale*, "in which masters may teach and students receive instruction in every lawful Faculty."³ As in this bull there is no express mention of any power granted to the graduates of Pamiers of being able to teach wherever they thought fit, it is possible that the *Studium* of the new city may have been of an inferior rank to those of Paris

¹ Bull of Jan. 16, 1303, ap. *Bullar.*, iv, p. 157.

² Bull of July 23, 1295, ap. *Bullar.*, iv, p. 132.

³ *Reg.*, n. 658, Dec. 18, 1295.

or Bologna. However this may be, the founding of four Universities is more than enough to place the name of Boniface VIII. in the very first place on the glorious scroll of the world's great promoters of learning.

But Boniface not only founded new Universities, he jealously watched over the older ones as well, guarding in each case their interests, and preventing their legitimate development from being interfered with by anyone. Notice of our own University of Oxford was brought before him at a comparatively early date in his pontificate. Oliver Sutton, bishop of Lincoln, in whose diocese Oxford then was, wrote to Boniface to obtain for its masters that very right, the *jus ubique docendi*, of which we have just spoken. He grounds his request "on the score that their University 'is by many believed to be the oldest of the seats of learning now flourishing among the Latins' ".¹ His petition was supported by John Halton, bishop of Carlisle (Sept. 3, 1296),² who, averring that Oxford was the nursing mother of English studies, and worthy of the honour of all lovers of learning, declared that, if the same favour of *ubique docendi* granted to Paris were not granted to Oxford, there would ensue disturbing strife among the scholars. How far Boniface was impressed by these claims and pretensions does not appear to be known, but a year or two later we find him decreeing for the good of the University that all its students were to be subject to the Chancellor only, and that they were to be free from interference from bishop or archbishop or even from the "legatus natus", i.e., the archbishop of Canterbury, who claimed to be the Pope's representative by right of his see.³ Some years later we

Boniface
supports
University
authorities.
(1) Oxford.

¹ Reg. of Bp. Sutton, Twyne MS., vol. ii, f. 19, cited by H. C. Maxwell Lyte, *A Hist. of the U. of O.*, p. 239.

² Ep. 76 in *Letters from Northern Registers*, p. 122, R. S.

³ Potthast, n. 24691, June 12, 1298.

find him defending the endowments of Merton College (1302).¹

Similar attempts on the restriction of the liberty of (2) Orleans. university students and their immediate authorities had been made or had been alleged to have been made by the bishop of Orleans. The University appealed to Boniface, who commissioned Peter, bishop of Auxerre, to examine into the matter. As he had once been a doctor in the University, he would understand the matter. He must act quietly, but firmly, in the interests of the University.²

Contrary, perhaps, to what some would expect from (3) Paris. the generally received notion of the character of Boniface, we find him when very serious trouble had arisen between the University of Paris and the Monastery of St. Germain-des-Prés—trouble which appears to have resulted in fighting and death—urging that the affair should be investigated “in a quiet way (*absque strepitu*), and with as little form of law as possible”, and arranged, if it may be, “amicably,” but if not, of course, judicially.³ Such, indeed, was the care of Boniface for the University of Paris that when, in the course of his difficulties with Philip the Fair, its doctors were summoned to Rome, he ordered its authorities, especially the chancellor, to see that doctors of theology and canon law were left in sufficient numbers for the carrying on “of such a useful and famous University”.

After this mass of evidence showing the enlightened zeal of Boniface for the advancement of learning, whether medical or theological, it will scarcely be believed that there have been writers who have accused him of being an enemy of science. He opposed, it is pretended, the dissection of the human body, and was an opponent of

Did
Boniface
forbid the
study of
anatomy?

¹ *Cal. of P. L.*, pp. 600, 602, 605.

² *Reg.*, n. 4013, March 1, 1301.

³ *Ib.*, n. 954, Feb. 13, 1296.

the science of anatomy. In proof of this, appeal is made to a decree of Canon Law, founded on a bull, "Detestandæ feritatis," of Boniface VIII.¹ The decree, out of respect for the human body, merely forbade dead bodies to be boiled, in order that, by thus removing the flesh, their bones might the more conveniently be sent back to be buried at home. Such a disgusting custom, practised by Crusaders and others, was very properly condemned.²

Piety of
Boniface.

The most fitting accompaniment of learning is piety. This harmonious union of qualities was, according to reliable authority, possessed by Boniface. A writer, seemingly of the fourteenth century, cited by Tosti,³ after freely abusing Boniface, adds: "Nevertheless these iniquities did not increase, because showing much devotion and humility in the churches, and devotion to the Holy Virgin, he never failed to repair to the church of the Lateran and the church named after the Crucifix (Sta. Croce), where he remained to pray two full hours daily."⁴ That at times, to say the very least, he gave proof even of a tender piety is clear from what Stefaneschi tells us of the tears that fell from his eyes at the sight of the relics in the Sancta Sanctorum, especially at the sight of the

¹ *Extravag. com.*, lib. iii, tit. 6 of John XXII., ed. Freidburg, ii, p. 1272 f., quoting a decree of Boniface of Feb. 20, 1299.

² Should anyone wish to know the names of writers who, in ignorance or malice, have made the above charge against Boniface, let him read Dr. J. J. Walsh, *The Popes and Science*, p. 28 ff. See also on the matter, Tosti, p. 251, and L. Tripepi, *Ragioni ad apologia di alcuni Papi*, p. 367 ff., Rome, 1894. For an instance of this "boiling", see *Vita Federici II.*, *Sicil. Regis.*, by F. Testa, p. 104.

³ *Vita B.*, in *Cod. Urbinat.*, n. 1675 of the Vatican library.

⁴ Ap. Tosti, p. 542. Cf. p. 393. On the former page are cited two prayers by Boniface in honour of Jesus crucified and of our Lady. Their author cannot have been without a strain of tender piety. On the latter page, relying on authorities which I cannot trace (Justinian in *Chron. Riccar.*, and *Ab. S. Just in Reg. S. Ben.*), Tosti says: "He celebrated Mass regularly and with great piety; and the tremendous sanctity of the sacrifice made him shed a abundant tears."

relic of the true Cross on which by His blood the Saviour of the world had washed away the sins of men.¹

In various ways, too, did Boniface give tangible evidence of his profound concern for things spiritual. Apart from his establishing the "Jubilee indulgence" of which something will be said later, he assigned the feast "De Corpore Christi" to the month of June,² and strove to encourage greater devotion to the Apostles, Evangelists, and the four great Doctors of the Latin Church, SS. Jerome, Augustine, Gregory, and Ambrose. Accordingly, on Sept. 20 in the first year of his pontificate (1295), he ordered that their feasts (hitherto merely reckoned as semi-doubles) should be observed as doubles, by the Dominican Order, and by the archdiocese of Rheims.³ Two years later, he enjoined the same obligation on the Universal Church.⁴ He was, he said, moved to act thus by reflecting how "their rich eloquence, under the influence of streams of divine grace, has unlocked the mysteries of the Holy Scriptures, unfastened their knots, illumined their obscurities and resolved their doubts. Moreover by their profound and beautiful discourses, the glorious fabric of the Church is resplendent as it were with flashing gems".

Boniface strove also to revive interest in that ancient and particularly Roman devotion of the "Stations". On April 6, 1297, he issued a bull in which he confirmed the "stationary" indulgences which that "most excellent Doctor and light of Holy Church, the blessed Gregory",

¹ "Hac igitur coram lacrimas in pectora fudit
Dulcis amor, pietasque viri, ceu credere fas est."

Vit. Bon., c. 14.

² Pipinus, *Chron.*, iv, 41.

³ Ep. to the O.P.s, ap. Martene, *Thes. anecdot.*, iv, 1863, and to the archbp. of Rheims, ap. Reynaldus, *Ann.*, 1295, n. 55 ff.

⁴ Ptolemy of Lucca, *H.E.*, xxiv, 36, and Mansi's note to Reynaldus, *l.c.*

and other Popes had granted to the patriarchal and to very many other churches of Rome to which flocked "a countless multitude from well-nigh every province of the world". Moreover, to show in a practical way his love for the city of Rome and the Church, Boniface decreed that all who were truly penitent, had confessed their sins and had visited any of the said churches from Ash-Wednesday till Easter Sunday inclusively, might gain an indulgence of a year and forty days; and, if they got the blessing of the Supreme Pontiff, a hundred days more.¹

Canonization
of St. Louis,
1297.

Writing in the year 1309 in the month of October, the old knight, Jehan, Sire de Joinville, after telling of the death of St. Louis IX. (1270), and of his burial at St. Denis, declares that there "God wrought many a fair miracle for his sake and by his merits". "Afterwards," he continued, "at the instance of the King of France (Philip III.) and by the Pope's orders, the archbishop of Rouen came, and brother John of Samoys, who afterwards became bishop. They came to St. Denis in France, and stayed there a long while, inquiring into his life and works and miracles; and I got word to go to them, and they kept me for two days. And after they had made inquiry of me and of others, what they had learnt was taken to the Court of Rome."² These examinations, commenced soon after the death of the Holy King by the command of Gregory X., began to be formally investigated in 1282, under Martin IV. Then, to resume the narrative of Joinville, "in accordance with what they (the Pope and the cardinals) read, they did him (King Louis) justice, and placed him among the martyr Confessors, which was,

¹ Potthast, 24503. The bull is printed in *Bullar. Basil. Vatic.*, iii, *Append.*, p. 6.

² *Memoirs of J.*, pp. 383-4, Eng. trans. by Wedgwood.

and always should be, a great joy to the kingdom of France, and a great honour to all his descendants who will copy him in well doing." Boniface displayed great interest in the canonization. He proclaimed it in a sermon which he preached on Sunday, August 11, 1297, in the church of the Friars Minor at Orvieto in the presence of Berengarius, archbishop of Bourges, and other prelates, and he decreed that his feast should be kept on the anniversary of his death each year (Aug. 25).¹ In his sermon, Boniface called attention to the care with which for over twenty-four years the circumstances of the King's life had been examined. Some sixteen years before, a list had been sent to Rome of sixty-three miracles which had been investigated by the commissioners. Cardinals had then been appointed by Martin IV., Honorius IV., and Nicholas IV. He himself had been one of those nominated by Nicholas, as previous cardinals had died, and he had himself written out the results of many of the examinations of the alleged miracles which had been sufficiently proved. More paper had been used over the inquiry than a mule could carry. Finally, when, during his pontificate, other supposed miracles had been put to the test, he had ordered the cardinals to give their opinions in writing "lest any one of them might conceal his views through love or hate or even through fear". After all this long and careful investigation, the Pope concluded that it was right and proper that the holy King's name should be added to the Catalogue of the Saints.² He accordingly, on the same day, issued a bull, "*Gloria laus*," to all the faithful of Christ, proclaiming the sanctity of King Louis and

¹ Cf. an addition to the Chron. of Martinus Pol., ap. *M. G. SS.*, xxii, p. 386.

² See the Pope's sermon, ap. Raynaldus, *Ann.*, 1297, nn. 58-9.

offering indulgences to such as with due sorrow visited his tomb.¹

In forming his own conclusions as to the character of Boniface from the two pictures which have now been put before him, and from the following story of his life, the seeker after truth would do well always carefully to consider how far the writers on whose testimony the facts are narrated were strictly contemporary, how near they were to the scene of action, and not only to what political party in a country they belonged, but even to what country, as, at length, nationality is now making itself distinctly felt. But, to whatever other conclusion about the character of Boniface VIII. such a seeker may come, it can scarcely be doubted that he will exclaim with Petrarch: "He was the wonder of peoples and Kings, and of the world." ²

¹ The bull gives a brief account of the career of S. Louis. Cf. *ib.*, n. 60 ff., but *Bullar.*, iv, 146, for the complete bull. See also Potthast, n. 24560-2, and document ap. Tosti (the sermon), p. 502 ff.

² *De otio religiosorum*, written c. 1347.

CHAPTER II.

ELECTION AND CORONATION OF BENEDICT GAETANI. HE
ANNOUNCES HIS ELECTION, AND ANNULS MANY OF
THE ACTS OF CELESTINE V. LOUIS OF ANJOU.
CREATIONS OF CARDINALS.

WE have already ¹ briefly noticed the election of cardinal Benedict as Pope on Dec. 24, 1294, but, as much was afterwards falsely said about it, its story must be told more at large.

Election of
Boniface,
1294.

After Pope Celestine V. had resigned the Papacy, and he had adjured the cardinals to elect a suitable successor to him without delay, it is said that they asked him to point out such a man. He accordingly, says one of our historians, "named a man called Benedict, a man of wisdom beyond all his fellows, who had often transacted business in the court of Rome." ²

However that may be, the cardinals who were present at the resignation summoned their absent brethren, and awaited their coming for the ten days prescribed by the constitution of Gregory X. ³ During the interval, three of the new cardinals arrived, and then Charles II. shut them all up; allowing, says one of our chroniclers, for each of them a cell of but 10 feet square, and only one servant apiece (Thurs., Dec. 23). ⁴ The same chronicler

¹ *Supra*, Vol. XVII, pp. 325-6,

² The author of the *Flores hist.* Though this passage does not occur in the edition of the Rolls series, iii, 92, it was found in the MS. from which Yonge made his translation of *Matthew of Westminster*, vol. ii, p. 505.

³ "Ubi periculum." Cf. the *Sixth Decretal*, lib. i, tit. vi, c. 3.

⁴ *Chron. of Lanercost*, ad an. 1294, sub. *fin.* Cf. Stefaneschi, *Vit. Bonif.*, c. 1.

"Proceres obstructis marmore valvis

Carcere clauduntur."

See also Bartholomew of C., *Chron.*, pp. 257-8.

goes on to assert that Benedict was elected by way "of compromise", as the cardinals had asked Celestine to nominate four cardinals who, in the name of the whole College, should choose the new Pope. He accordingly selected Benedict and three others, "who unanimously chose Benedict." Villani, on the other hand, following some Colonna legend, pretends that Benedict, knowing that King Charles had control of the twelve new cardinals, went to Charles and said to him: "King, thy Pope Celestine had the will and the means to serve thee in the Sicilian war, but he had not the knowledge. Now, if thou wilt work with thy friends the cardinals that I may be elected Pope, I shall know, I shall will, and I shall be able." ¹

Rejecting, however, both mistakes and fables, we will narrate the story of the election on the authority of Stefaneschi, and other reliable sources.² After Mass and the usual prayers had been said, the election began on Friday (Dec. 24), in the ordinary way by the method of "scrutiny". If we are to follow Sifrid of Balshusen, cardinal Matteo Rosso was elected at the first scrutiny, but refused to be nominated. The second scrutiny led to no result; but at the third, Benedict Gaetani was unanimously elected,³ and "changed his good name

¹ *Chron.*, viii, 6. The account of the election given by Ferreti is on the same lines; but, says his editor, Cipolla, "allargato e fatto piu fantastico," i, p. 68, n. With Tosti (p. 81) he gives no credence to it. The former, moreover, quotes the Urbino MS. abusive *life* of Boniface to the effect that Charles did not want him to be Pope because he knew him to be "an avaricious man and a traitor, even though he was learned and fit to manage the Papacy", pp. 82-3, n.

² Such as the manifesto of the College of cardinals against the schismatical Colonnas. Ap. H. Denifle, in *Archiv für Lit. und Kirchengeschichte*, v. (1889), p. 524 ff.

³ *Compend. hist.*, c. 236, ap. *M. G. SS.*, xxv, p. 712. Cf. *Chron. Suessanum*, p. 61. Elected "per omnes cardinales Neapoli existentes".

Benedict into a better, and became Boniface".¹ However true these details may be, it is certain that he was ultimately *unanimously* elected, and consequently by the Colonna cardinals along with the others,² and it is only just to ascribe his speedy election to the influence of Celestine.

Owing to a work published soon after the death of Boniface, some details may be here given of a papal election by "scrutiny" at this period. The work in question is known as *Ordo Romanus XIV.*, and appears to have come from the useful pen of cardinal James Stefaneschi.³

The cardinals in conclave, it appears, began their work by electing from their own body "three scrutineers of the College" whose business it was to collect the votes of the cardinals, and "three scrutineers of the scrutineers", whose duty it was to check the records of the original scrutineers. The six were selected, two from each of the three grades in the Sacred College. Each cardinal

¹ *Flores hist.*, iii, 276, R. S.

² Stef., *l.c.*, "Scrutantesque suum per clausa silentia votum." He was elected unanimously: "Nam digna quidem concordia vocum accessit." (Cf. "concorditer" of *Mart. Polon. contin. Brabant.*, ap. *M. G. SS.*, xxiv., p. 261.) The two Colonna cardinals elected him with the others.

"Nam promptus uterque

Te legit, submissa pedi dans oscula supplex."

The hopes of Charles were disappointed:—

"Caroli spes cepta precando

Defecit, miserante Deo."

Cf. Ptol. of Lucca, *H.E.*, xxiv, c. 34, and the story of Celestine's resignation, ap. *Letters from N. Reg.*, p. 110. Villani, *l.c.*, too, allows that Jas. Colonna elected B., and, to his regret, does also Ubertino da Casale, *Arbor vit. crucifixe*, lib. v, c. 8; *Cont. Brabant.*, *l.c.*; and a document of King Charles II., ap. Min. Niccio, *Studi su' fascicoli Angioini*, pp. 28–9, where the King says: "cum notorium sit quod vacante sede . . . ipsi (Jas. and P. Col.) maledicti . . . ipsum elegerunt una cum aliis ad Apostolatus officium." See also *Cron. Urbev.*, ap. *R. I. SS.*, t. xv, pt. v, p. 201, new ed., and the declaration of the College of Cardinals against the Colonna cards., pp. 527–8.

³ Ap. Mabillon, *Mus. Ital.*, vol. ii, p. 243 ff., Paris, 1689, or Migne, *P.L.*, t. 78.

recorded his vote in writing thus : " I N., bishop of N., elect as supreme Pontiff the venerable Father the lord N., cardinal-deacon of N." During the process of voting, it is laid down that nothing has to be said of the comparative merits of the several candidates, but only the number of votes accorded to each has to be proclaimed. At least two-thirds of the votes, apart from that of the elected himself, was required for a valid election.¹

Annuls the
acts of
Celestine V.
and some of
those of
Nicholas IV.

One of the very first official acts of Boniface was to declare null and void the acts of his predecessor. When resigning the Papacy, Celestine had several times earnestly begged that his successor would amend what he had done amiss.² But he had done so many foolish things, in every department, making, for instance, grants of money that belonged to others, or ordering people to pay money twice over,³ that the only course open to Boniface was to declare all his acts invalid, and submit them all to a fresh examination.⁴ Accordingly, in the words of Bartholomew of Cotton (who gives in full the bulls which Boniface subsequently issued on the subject), in public consistory : " On the feast of St. John (the

¹ Many more details are given in the document we have cited, and may there be read by the curious.

² Cf. *supra*, Vol. XVII, pp. 294, 321, etc. To give yet another reference, "Hic per Celestinum . . . rogatus, omnes litteras per eundem C. quibuscunque gracie concessas, corrigendas vel infirmandas, revocavit." *Mart. Pol. Contin. pontif. Ang.*, ap. *M. G. SS.*, xxiv., 718.

³ *Reg.*, 26 and 202.

⁴ Cf. Stefaneschi, *De coron. B.*, i, c. 3, who speaks of the "virtus simplicis inscitie" of Peter of Morrone, and tells how

"seductus et expers

"Pronus in omne datum, mores confuderit omnes."

Consequently :—

"Igitur vacuata jubemus

Viribus indulta."

We are assured that in this revocation Boniface acted on the advice of the cardinals. Cf. *Ann. Austriæ*, ap. *M. G. SS.*, ix, p. 750. See the *Reg. of Archb. John le Romeyn*, p. 23, ed. Surtees for some of the provisions of Celestine.

Evangelist, Dec. 27), the lord Pope recalled all the *provisions* made during the time of his predecessors, Celestine and Nicholas IV., as also those made by Gerard of Parma and himself when in France. He suspended also all appointments to bishoprics and other dignities which Celestine had made without consulting the cardinals, or which had not been made in the ordinary way in consistory. In like manner, he also suspended all nominations to posts in the papal household, and all the papal chaplains. He, moreover, declared his intention of reconstituting his household, and proclaimed that, though their names would not be made public till he reached Rome, he had already fixed upon a chamberlain and vice-chamberlain. With the exception of the (Florentine) companies of the Mori and Spini,¹ and the (Pistoian) company of the Clarentes, he cancelled the connection of all the other companies of merchant bankers with the Apostolic *camera* (treasury). He recalled too all the commissions appointed by Celestine and all his decisions. He suspended also all the papal *scriptores*, sergeants, and proctors (*correrii*) nominated by Celestine and Nicholas IV. It is even said that he suspended the papal notaries, but, except in the case of the lord Bartholomew of Capua, this cannot be stated with certainty. Finally, he decided that the curia should proceed to Rome." So far Bartholomew of Cotton.²

¹ The text has, "Spumas." Cf. in confirmation of this ep. 71 to John, bp. of Carlisle, ap. *Letters from N. Reg.*, p. 114 ff. R.S. Cf. *ib.*, n. 68.

² *Hist. Ang.*, p. 258. Cf. the bulls "Olim Celestinus", etc. of Apr. 8, 1295, ap. *ib.*, p. 265, etc., and ap. *Reg.*, n. 770 ff. See also the English continuation of the Chron. of Martinus Polonus, ap. *M. G. SS.*, xxx, p. 718, where we are also told that at Celestine's own request, Boniface reviewed all the favours granted by him in order to their subsequent confirmation or annulment. It is also there stated that B. also recalled the favours regarding benefices "about to become vacant" which Nicholas IV. had granted.

Christendom
is informed
that
Celestine's
acts are all
subject to
revision,
1295.

Merely pausing to note that we are assured that this last decision greatly annoyed King Charles,¹ we must add that Boniface further decided that "no half bullæ"² were in future to be issued by the curia. One consequence of this decision was that it was not till after his consecration that the Catholic world was notified about the annulment of the acts of Celestine. The bull "Olim Celestinus"³ began by stating that, under deception, Pope Celestine had been induced to do many things which had to be corrected; that he had himself, on his resignation, begged that his successor would revoke what he had done imprudently; and that, "whilst we were still at Naples," after our election, he had addressed the like petition to us. Wherefore, seeing the evil that had resulted or would result from such acts, Boniface decreed the withdrawal of all the dispensations, grants, provisions, exemptions, infeudations, and alienations of Church property, spiritual concessions, contracts, etc., etc., as he had done in consistory on Dec. 27, 1294. For purposes of revision, cases had to be presented for papal judgment by those who were attached to the papal court in the course of eight days from the appointed date, by Italians within four months, and by others within a year.

Necessary as these sweeping measures were, they made more enemies than friends for the new Pope. Some persons, of course, were directly benefited by them; and so we find the compiler of the *Annals of Dunstable* glad to record that the decree of Boniface had freed his

¹ *M. Pol. cont. Brab.*, ap. *M. G. SS.*, xxiv, p. 261. The suspension of Bart. of Capua must have equally annoyed him. *Supra*, Vol. XVII, p. 289. B. severed at once all the bonds linking him to dependence on Charles.

² On "half-bulls", cf. *supra*, vol. xi, p. 49.

³ In subsequently dealing with some of the "Celestine" cases, Boniface often repeated parts of this bull. Cf. e.g., the bull ap. Rymer, ii, 700, of Dec. 13, 1295.

monastery from having to provide a certain clerk of Liscombe with the first of their vacant churches.¹ Again, not all who had benefited by Celestine's extravagant liberality were, after the examination of their cases, ultimately deprived of the privileges they had received from him. Edward I. and cardinal James Colonna, for instance, were allowed, as we have seen, to keep Celestine's unprecedented grant to them of the firstfruits of ecclesiastical benefices in the province of Canterbury.² Similarly, the archbishop of York, John le Romeyn, had, while making express mention of the decree of Boniface, to grant the prebends in his archdiocese *provided* by Celestine for Oddo, the brother of cardinal Peter Colonna, and for Bertrand, the brother of Bernard, cardinal-bishop of Albano.³ Others again, if they did not have privileges granted them by Celestine, got others. In this category came the case of St. Louis of Anjou. He had been named archbishop of Lyons. Regarded by Boniface as incapable of filling that most important see owing to his youth, he was granted the see of Toulouse.⁴ Still the new Pope was wholly unable to satisfy all those who had preyed upon the simplicity of his predecessor, and the number of his enemies grew.

This constitution was issued from the Lateran palace on Apr. 8, 1295.⁵ On the same day the bull "Pridem ad apicem" was published, by which, on account of trouble and loss caused to many prelates by them, Boniface annulled all the provisions, reservations, etc., granted by Nicholas IV.⁶

¹ *Ann. de D.*, p. 393.

² See Celestine's grant, ap. Bart. of C., *Hist.*, p. 261.

³ See his *Register*, p. 23, ed. Surtees.

⁴ Cf. *supra*, Vol. XVII, p. 299. Cf. *Calendar of Close Rolls*, 1288-96, p. 442.

⁵ Ap. Bart. of Cotton, *Hist.*, p. 265 ff.

⁶ Ap. *ib.*, p. 271 ff. The bull proclaimed that its ordinances affected even the convents of St. Clare, and the famous hospital of S. Spirito

The cardinal of Ostia is deprived of the use of the pallium.

Another drastic action performed by the Pope previous to his leaving Naples was, for some reason unknown to us, to take to task very severely cardinal Hugh Seguin of the Order of Preachers, and to deprive him temporarily of the use of the pallium. It had not, however, been restored to him even when in Rome he placed the tiara on the head of Boniface.¹

The Pope sets out for Rome, 1295.

Immediately after the new year, Boniface, exhorting its people to loyalty and its King to clemency, left Naples for Rome with the ex-Pope in his train.² He was resolved to free the Papacy at once from its dependence on Charles. His journey to Rome was slow because, among other reasons, the dangers of the road were considerable.³ At Anagni he was received with the greatest pomp by his fellow citizens, who were supported by a number of the Roman nobility who had come thither to offer him for life the Senatorship of the city. This dignity duly received, Boniface hurried on to Rome, heedless of fatigue and the cold of winter, for he was happy, says Stefaneschi, in his new-found freedom.⁴ When he drew near the city, all Rome poured out to meet him, like a bride

in Saxia in Rome. Cf. the similar bull "Dudum circa", of the same date (*ib.*, p. 277 ff.), where for Celestine and *Honorius*, it is to be presumed we should read Nicholas IV. Cf. n. 58, p. 111, of the *Letters from N. Reg., R. S.*, April 8 must have been a busy day for Boniface, as decisions were also issued regarding "the administrators in cases of persons who have been injured by clerical bodies or by clerics" (*ib.*, p. 274 ff.), and most humanely forbidding women to be dragged from their homes to give evidence, and, if nuns, they were not to be summoned even if willing. *Ib.*, p. 279. Cf. *Ann. de Wigorn.*, p. 518; *Ann. de Dunst.*, pp. 383, 393.

¹ Nich. Trivet, *Chron.*, p. 334.

² Stet., *De coron.*, i. c. 5.

³ See the letter of B. to K. Edw. of Feb. 19 1295. He speaks of his journey to Rome "quem viarum periculosa discrimina non modicum retardarunt". Ap. Bart. of C. p. 281, or Rymer, ii, 669.

⁴ Stef., *l.c.* "Tanta quies animis, libertas reddita cum sit."

hastening to meet "her spouse just released from the prison of an enemy".¹ Passing through the gate of the city, the Pope went first to the Lateran basilica to pray, and then, by the gaily bedecked "papal way", made his way to the Vatican (Jan. 17, 1295).² In all probability one of his first acts when he reached the city was to nominate as Senator in his place Hugolini Jacobini of Parma. At any rate we know that Hugolini was already Senator in the beginning of March.³

The hurried departure⁴ of Boniface from Naples was, if little agreeable to Charles, still less so seemingly to his people. They had discovered the advantages, spiritual and temporal, of having the Pope in their midst, and were angry that Boniface did not follow in the wake of Celestine. Accordingly, we find them publicly rejoicing when a rumour reached them that he had died suddenly. Their King, however, was far too wise to quarrel with the Pope; and so sent word that the ringleaders of the insult should be punished.⁵ He had already left his capital with his son Charles Martel, the King of Hungary, in order that with him he might be present at Boniface's consecration, which had been fixed for January 23. The ceremony which took place on that day with great

Boniface is
consecrated
and
crowned.

¹ *Ib.*

² *Ib.* The date is furnished by doc. 58, ap. *Letters from N. Reg.*

³ Cf. *Chron. Parm.*, ap. *R. I. SS.*, vol. ix, p. 70, new ed., and various notices of him in Bouard, *Le régime polit. de Rome*, p. 248. Boniface himself, ep. of March 13, 1297, in nominating Pandulf Savelli Senator, says that the rule of the city was "unanimously" committed to him by the people. Ap. Theiner, *Cod. Dip.*, i, p. 344. Savelli was appointed for a year from the date of the letter.

⁴ He had not waited till baggage animals could be collected for the transport of the papal belongings, for on Feb. 15, 1295, we find King Charles ordering his officials to find 300 mules (*somerii*) to carry them to Rome. M. Riccio, *Saggio di Cod. dip.*, Supp., i, n. 82.

⁵ *Reg. Caroli II.*, 1294, c. 65, fol. 159, quoted by Gregorovius, *Rome*, v, p. 531, n.

splendour has been described for us in detail by Stefaneschi in his poem on the coronation of Boniface.¹ But, as descriptions of similar coronations have been given elsewhere in this work,² there is no need for us to follow the cardinal too scrupulously.

Arrived at St. Peter's in the early morning of a bright day, Boniface exchanged his red robes for a white alb, the variegated fanon, the pectoral cross, the stole, the tunic, and dalmatic, the cope, and the mitre with its double points signifying the Old and the New Law. From his left arm hung the maniple; gauntlets covered his hands, and a ring gleamed on one of his fingers. Thus vested, and accompanied by the bishop of Ostia and the other two assistant consecrating bishops, the Pope advanced to the altar over the tomb of St. Peter—an altar of carved marble with four porphyry columns supporting a canopy of silver which time, says Stefaneschi, had turned black. Praying that God who had made him “primate of all the bishops of the world, and teacher of the Universal Church” would give him grace,³ the bishop of Ostia duly consecrated him, put the episcopal ring on the third finger of his right hand, and invested him with the pallium.⁴ After the singing of the *Laudes*,

¹ With it compare his *Ordo Romanus*.

² Vols. VIII, p. 8 ff., and XI, 29 ff.

³ *Ordo R. XIV.*, c. 45. Tosti, p. 89 f., believes that, before his consecration, Boniface pronounced the profession of faith assigned to him in Oldoini's ed. of Ciacconius (printed also by Tosti himself, p. 465), which is practically identical with that taken by the Popes in the early Middle Ages. Cf. n. 83, ap. Sickel's ed. of the *Liber Diurnus*. There is no reason why he should not have made such a profession, but Stefaneschi does not allude to such an act.

⁴ Stef., *l.c.*, ii, c. 3.

“Pallia tunc humeris, crucibus candentia nigris,
Imposuit levita rubeus.”

In this place, S. says that it was the first of the cardinal-deacons who invested Boniface with the pallium.

and the other ceremonies of the consecration and the Mass were over, the Pope, surrounded by the nobles—Orsini, Colonnas, Savelli, Stefaneschi, Conti, Annibaldeschi, and the others—and accompanied by the Prefect of the city, Peter de Vico,¹ left the basilica, and took up a position before its door. There seated on a throne, he was solemnly crowned by the first of the deacons. The tiara (or phrygium), “the mark of his power” (*imperii signum*), consisted of a crown or circlet of gold set with gems from which sprang a conical cap of peacock’s feathers, adorned with jewels and surmounted by a carbuncle.²

After the coronation, Boniface mounted a gaily caparisoned white horse which was led for a brief space by the Kings of Naples and Hungary,³ clad in scarlet, and in the usual manner, by the accustomed route, rode to the Lateran. When the customary ceremonies at the *sedes stercoraria*, and at the two porphyry chairs, or *symæ*, had been duly performed there, and the Pope had prayed devoutly before the great relics of the Sancta Sanctorum,⁴ the distinguished company adjourned to the principal hall of the Lateran palace for the state banquet.

The scene therein made a great impression on our poetical historian—the hall itself with its gilt ornaments, bright tapestries, and ordered tables, loaded with wines

Procession
to the
Lateran.

¹ Now, says Stef., *l.c.*, ii, c. 5, “magnum sine viribus omen.”

² Tosti, p. 91, supposes that this tiara had two crowns, but whether Boniface added a second crown to the tiara towards the end of his life or not, it is clear from Stef., *l.c.*, ii, c. 7, that he was crowned with a tiara having but one crown. Cf. E. Muntz, *La tiare pontif.*, c. 5, “Boniface VIII. et l’addition de la seconde couronne.” It is acknowledged that no existing monument gives Boniface a tiara with two crowns.

³ Stef., *l.c.*, ii, c. 9.

⁴ *Ib.*, c. 14:

“Hac igitur coram lacrimas in pectore fudit
Dulcis amor pietasque viri, ceu credere fas est.”

and viands and jewelled drinking cups, the splendid attire of the guests, the Pope in his pontificals, the Kings wearing their crowns, the nobles in their state dresses, and the senate in their official robes. For a brief space the Kings waited on the Pope, and then took their places between the cardinal-bishops and the cardinal-priests. At length the tired Pontiff and even our poet were glad to retire to rest. The Pontiff especially needed all the rest he could get, for, concludes his panegyrist, great toil was in store for him in the efforts he was to make to overcome the wicked and put down the proud.¹ Well did he choose for his motto: "Incline unto mine aid, O Lord."

Boniface
announces
his election,
1295.

During all these festivities, Boniface was worried by the conduct of the ex-Pope, Celestine. But, as we have already told the story of his flight, capture, and confinement,² we may proceed to cite the announcement of his election which the new Pope made to Christendom. On Jan. 24, he addressed an encyclical, beginning "Gloriosus et mirabilis" to the Catholic world: "God, wonderful and glorious in all His works, and most bountiful in His mercies, who exercises His compassion in this world full as it is of trials and dissensions, ceases not duly to favour the Church, which He, the Maker of all

¹ "Magnus enim magnusque labor venturus adibit Pontificem, vincetque malos subdetque superbos." Stef., *l.c.*, ii, 15. If we can trust a distant chronicler, the banquet had not the happy termination implied by the poet. It is said that, owing to the pressure, some of the guests fell down when descending some steps of the palace near the Sancta Sanctorum. Others fell on top of them, and yet again others, till some 50 clerics and laymen were killed. *Mart. Pol. cont. Brabant.*, ap. *M. G. SS.*, xxiv, p. 261.

² The author of the *Gesta Boemundi Arch. Trev.*, c. 24, ap. *M. G. SS.*, xxiv, p. 476, very sensibly notes that Boniface kept him in custody "ex industria, ne forte error oriretur in populo et verteretur in scandalum et conculcationem ecclesiasticæ libertatis." As it was, the Colonnas and others were able to make mischief enough over the resignation of Celestine.

things, has founded. . . . As her watchful guardian, He is ever at her side, never sleeping, but ever ready to hasten to her needs. . . . Hence is she fearless in the midst of anguish and afflictions . . . not being intimidated by resounding threats nor overcome by the assaults of adversities. . . . With her sails of a right and proper intention unfurled on the living tree of the saving Cross . . . boldly does she pass over the stormy sea of this world . . .

“ (Lately) by the free and spontaneous resignation (*per liberam et spontaneam cessionem*), for certain reasonable and legitimate causes, of our beloved brother, Peter Morrone, formerly Roman Pontiff, in the presence of our venerable brethren the bishops, and of our beloved sons the cardinal-priests and deacons (of whom we then were one), the Roman Church became vacant. . . . This resignation was accepted by the cardinals; for the records of former Popes, and an express constitution made it clear that such a resignation could legitimately be effected, and the cardinals expressly approved of its being effected.” Boniface then went on to say that the cardinals, anxious to avoid the difficulties engendered by a long vacancy of the Holy See, shut themselves up in conclave in the Castel Nuovo, and elected him though there were many more suitable men among them. He hesitated to take the great burden on his weak shoulders; but not wishing to seem to oppose the divine will nor by a refusal to turn the unanimity of the electors into dissent, he agreed to their wishes, trusting, he said, to “ Him who never abandons those who trust in Him”. In conclusion he earnestly begged that all would pray that he might rule the Church of God aright.¹

¹ Ap. *Bullar. Rom.*, iv, p. 124 ff; Rymer, ii, 667 ff.; *Reg.*, n. 1; in several of the Registers of our bishops, e.g., in that of John de Pontissara, ii, 826; Tosti, p. 466. We have often used his translation.

Special
address to
Philip the
Fair.

The copy of this fine encyclical sent to Philip of France had a special conclusion. In it, reminding Philip that justice is the glory of Kings, he exhorted him ever to practise it without forgetting mercy, in order that his people might sit in the richness of peace. He begged him, too, after the manner of his ancestors, to cherish the Church, and to honour Christ in his ministers. Then recalling the fact that, when he was "in a minor office", he had shown him special affection, he bade him have recourse to him in his difficulties and he would ever find him a father ready to promote his happiness and prosperity.¹ Philip did not follow a single item of this advice. But, when we consider his oppression of his subjects and of the Church in his realm, when we reflect on his treatment of the very first of Christ's ministers, on his diabolical cruelty to the Knights Templars, and on the fact that he never allowed his subjects to enjoy "opulent rest", we cannot fail to realize that Boniface, at any rate, knew the matters on which he needed guidance.

Joy of
James II. at
the election
of Boniface.

On receipt of the encyclical, or sometimes even before its receipt, the rulers spiritual and temporal of Christendom notified the election of Boniface to their subjects. In informing his people of the accession of Benedict Gaetani, James II. of Aragon impressed upon them his great satisfaction, because, he said, "from his creation we trust that by means of his wisdom and industry there will come to the whole world a glorious period of peace and concord." He, therefore, called upon his people to thank God for the election "of so useful and worthy a Pope".²

Boniface at
once works
for peace.

If, as a matter of fact, Christendom did not, during the pontificate of Boniface, enjoy the state of peace looked forward to by James of Aragon, the fault was, in the main, not due to Boniface. He earnestly desired, and worked

¹ *Reg.*, p. 4. ² Ep. of Jan. 23, 1295, ap. Finke, *Mon. Aragon.*, i, p. 27.

hard to promote peace in Europe, if only for the cause of the Crusade to which he was devoted. In 1298 he was able to write to the patriarch of the Armenians: "From the very beginning of our promotion to the apostolic dignity, among the many cares which our pastoral office forced upon us, we devoted, as God is our witness, ceaseless toil to furthering the cause of peace among the western kings and princes, especially among those who were wont to show themselves most fit and ready to fight in aid of the Holy Land." ¹

In the words of one of our chroniclers, he wrote immediately after his consecration to the Kings of France, England, Germany, Aragon, and Spain, and to the other great ones across the seas that none of them should attempt to wage war on the other, but that they should send plenipotentiaries to him "to treat of peace and the Crusade". "He strove hard, too, to hurry forward the Crusade, and expressed his desire to take part in it in person." ² But Boniface did not confine his attention in the matter of peace-making to the Transalpine peoples. He lost no time in exhorting the various States in Italy to keep the peace. Especially did he exhort thereto the great maritime states of Genoa and Venice, whose commercial rivalries were for centuries the curse of Christendom. He gave them to understand that he expected them to send him within the octave of next Easter plenipotentiaries to treat of peace, and that, meanwhile, they must, under pain of excommunication and interdict, observe the truce which he proclaimed had to last from the date of the receipt of his letters to the feast of St. John the Baptist. ³

¹ *Reg.*, n. 2663, Oct. 26.

² *Ann. de Dunst.*, pp. 383-4. "Et in propria persona vult transfretare." Cf. *Ann. de Wigorn.*, pp. 518-19.

³ Potthast, n. 24022, Feb. 13.

A fortnight later (Feb. 27) he approached in the same spirit a much more delicate question—that of Sicily, one of the rocks on which his peace projects were to split.¹

Leaving this point to the following chapter, we will conclude this by an enumeration of the successive creations of cardinals made by Boniface during his pontificate.

New
cardinals.

Not long after his accession, at any rate in the first half of the year 1295, Boniface made his nephew, Benedict Gaetani, cardinal-deacon of SS. Cosmas and Damian († 1296). He had already been favoured by Honorius IV.,² and Boniface gave him what has been described as “ the great Aldobrandesco county which stretched from about Monte Argentario to Monte Amiata, and along the valley of the Paglia to Lake Bolsena, and from there to the sea in the neighbourhood of Corneto ”, and which had been bequeathed to the Holy See.³

In a second promotion in the same year (Dec. 17) he created five cardinals. Two of them were also nephews (Jas. Thomasius, O.M., card.-p. of S. Clemente, and Francis Gaetani, card.-d. of SS. Cosmas and Damian), and another, our poetical historian, James Gaetani, “ de Stephanescis ” (card.-d. of St. George in Velabro) is also supposed to have been a relative of the new Pope. The remaining two were Francis Napoleon Orsini, cardinal-deacon of Sta. Lucia in Selce, and the vice-chancellor, Peter Valerian Duraguerra, cardinal-deacon of Sta. Maria Nuova.

About a year later (Dec. 4) under somewhat dramatic circumstances, Boniface created four more cardinals. Whilst he was at Rieti and was about to say Mass on the feast of St. Andrew the Apostle (Nov. 30), the whole

¹ *Ib.*, n. 24033.

² See his *Register*, nn. 945–6.

³ *Chron. Urbevet.*, p. 200.

district was visited by a most appalling earthquake, which lasted for four days. The Pope and his court had to take refuge in huts of boughs which were hastily erected in the open fields. When the tremors of the earth had ceased, and Boniface had started for Rome, torrential rains forced him to turn aside into a Dominican convent near Rieti. There in the chapter-house, he raised to the cardinalate the archbishop of Toledo, who became bishop of Albano; his chamberlain Theoderic Rainerius of Orvieto (card.-p. of S. Croce), afterwards (June 13, 1299) bishop of Boniface's new city, Civitas papalis (Palestrina); Nicholas Boccasini, Master-General of the Dominicans (card.-p. of Sta. Sabina), afterwards bishop of Ostia and Pope Benedict XI.; and Richard Petronus of Siena, vice-chancellor, cardinal-deacon of S. Eustachio.¹

In the spring (March 2) of 1300, a fourth promotion made three more cardinals, Leonard Patrassus, archbishop of Capua, who became bishop of Albano; Gentile de Montefiore, O.M., one of the professors in Curia (card.-p. of S. Martino ai Monti); and Luke Fieschi of the family of the counts of Laragna, a relative of James II. of Aragon (card.-d. of S. Maria in via Lata).

In a last creation (Dec. 15, 1302) there were promoted: Peter Hispanus, bishop of Burgos, who became cardinal-bishop of the Sabina, Minister-General of the Franciscans, John Minius "de Murrovallium", who became bishop of Porto.²

¹ Cf. B. Guidonis, *Vit.*, p. 671, *Ann. de Wigornia*, p. 539; and Ptolemy of L., *Annales*, p. 1302.

² Eubel, *Hierarchia Cath.*, pp. 12-13. Following, as he said, in the wake of Honorius III., Boniface decreed the severest penalties against any who should in any way do injury to a cardinal or his near relatives. "What ruler would be safe if . . . the special sons of the Roman Church were exposed to danger." *Sext. Decret.*, lib. v, tit. ix, c. 5, ed. Friedberg, ii, p. 1091 f.

CHAPTER III.

THE AFFAIRS OF SICILY. THE HUNGARIAN SUCCESSION.

Sources.—They have all been quoted already, but may be briefly enumerated here in order that the reader may have them together. Of special value from the number of documents which it contains is the *Chronicon Siciliae*, published up to the year 1328 ap. R. I. SS., x. The last ten chapters bringing the chronicle to 1343 are to be found ap. R. Gregorio, *Bibliotheca Script. qui res sub Aragonum imperio in Sicilia gestas retulere*, ii, 107 ff., Palermo, 1791-2. Important also is the *Cronicon Siculum* (which goes down to 1396), at least from the year 1303, ed. J. de Blasiis, Naples, 1887. Of some use also are the *Cronache Siciliane* of the thirteenth to the fifteenth century in the Sicilian dialect, published by V. di Giovanni, Bologna, 1865. About the year 1337, Nicholas Specialis, a literary statesman and friend of King Frederick II. of Sicily, wrote his *Historia Sicula* (1282-1337), which perhaps suffers a little in candour from that friendship. Ap. R. I. SS., x. From the fact that it was not written till the last quarter of the fifteenth century, the *Historia Sicula* of Laurentius Bonincontrius (3 small vols., ed. J. Lami, Florence, 1740) is of no particular moment for our period. Lami only printed seven books of the *Historia*. Bk. viii, treating of Johanna I. and Charles III. of Durazzo, and Bk. ix, treating of Ladislaus and Johanna II., have not yet been printed. After his *Historia*, B. compiled *Annals* from 853 to 1458. Muratori, R. I. SS., t. xxi, has printed the portion from 1360. But these *Annals* do not treat of Sicily in particular.

C. M. Riccio has produced a number of works which furnish us with useful extracts from the Neapolitan archives of the House of Anjou—e.g., his *Saggio di Codice Diplomatico*, Naples, 1878 ff., *Studi Storici su' fascicoli Angioini*, Naples, 1863, etc.

For the connection between Aragon and Sicily at this period, we have the *Chronicle* of Muntaner, of whom we have already spoken, and the *Crónica de San Juan de la Peña* (Saragossa, 1876), the first general Chronicle of Aragon, which goes down to 1336, and is especially full on the "great peace" of Boniface.

It is likely that it is the work of Bernard Dezcoll, secretary of Pedro IV. of Aragon, and for a time (1332-53) his vice-treasurer. His *Crónica* is about as naïvely pro-Aragon as that of Muntaner. In vol. i of the *Anales de la corona de Aragon*, by G. Zurita, chronicler of the kingdom, Saragossa, 1610, an account of the events of this period may be read, since it is well founded on the original authorities.

Modern Works.—It is unfortunate that *Il regno di Sicilia di Carlo II. d'Angiò*, Milan, 1924, of A. Cutolo, is confined, as the other part of the title shows, to the last years of Charles' reign—*negli ultimi anni di vita*. In any case the story told by Sig. Cutolo is short. It is a pity, because his book is most attractive from the clear simplicity of its style, and useful from an appendix of 99 documents belonging to the years 1308-9. F. Testa (archbishop of Monreale) *De vita Federici II., Siciliae Regis*, Palermo, 1775, also has an Appendix of documents. A very excellent little book is *Carlomartello d'Angiò*, by M. Schipa, Naples, 1926. Murena's *Vita di Roberto, Re di Napoli*, Naples, 1770, is written in the form of *Annals* (1309-43), with an historical introduction. Much more useful is St. Clair Baddeley's *Robert the Wise and his heirs* (1278-1352), London, 1897. They will both be superseded by R. Caggese, *Roberto d'Angiò*, Florence, 1922. Only the first vol. has appeared so far. S. V. Bozzo, in his *Note storiche Siciliane*, Palermo, 1882, treats of the events which followed the peace of Caltabellota (1302) to the death of Frederick of Aragon, 1337. There is an appendix of 36 documents from 1304-37. The old work entitled *Breve istoria del dominio temporale della sede Apostolica nelle due Sicilie*, Rome, 1789, is also useful, especially by reason of its appendix of documents.

Of the vast inheritance of trouble to which Boniface succeeded, the greatest was the state of things in the island of Sicily. To safeguard their rights as overlords of the "Two Sicilies", to prevent themselves from being crushed between the hammer and the anvil, if they suffered the Emperor to become the effective ruler of the Kingdom, the Popes had thought it necessary to bring in an outside power. They accordingly invoked the assistance of the House of Anjou, and succeeded in accomplishing their purpose. But their deliverers landed

Boniface
tries to
win over
Frederick.

them into a fresh heap of difficulties. As often happens with the French, success made them insolent, and their insolence resulted in the terrible revolt of the Sicilians in 1282. The kingdom of the Two Sicilies was rent in twain. Still the French had been their deliverers, and so the Popes felt bound in honour to stand by them. Martin IV. and his immediate successors strove, by every means in their power, once more to bring back the island under their sway. But its people, while willing enough to acknowledge the overlordship of the Popes, would not accept the rule of the Angevins. Boniface, therefore, following the example of his predecessors, thought there was nothing left but to endeavour to force them to accept it. Still he hoped to be able to work his will by peaceful methods, and so tried the power of persuasion.

Boniface
writes to
Frederick,
1295.

When Boniface became Pope, conditions of peace had been drawn up and approved by Rome, by which James II. of Aragon, to secure his kingdom in Spain from the claims of Charles of Valois, had agreed to surrender Sicily to Charles II. of Anjou.¹ Boniface, however, knew full well that it was one thing for James to agree to restore Sicily to Charles, and quite another to induce his brother, who was actually in possession of it, to give it up, or to induce the Sicilians to return to the allegiance of the House of Anjou. On Feb. 17, 1295, Charles had done homage to Boniface for the Two Sicilies,² and a little before that date the Pope, on his side, had, on account of the financial difficulties created by the Sicilian war, granted the King a delay in paying the *Census* due to the Church.³

In the same month, Boniface opened his negotiations with Frederick. On his own account, that prince had already sent envoys, Manfred Lancia and Roger of

¹ Cf. *supra*, Vol. XVII, p. 308. ² *Reg.*, n. 117. Cf. 118-19.

³ *Ib.*, n. 128, Feb. 6, 1295.

Geremia, with letters to Boniface. The Pope replied by asking Frederick to have an interview with him, and to bring along with him John of Procida, Roger Loria, and a number of representative Sicilians, so that matters could be finally arranged between them. He concluded by informing him that by Bernard of Camerino, his chaplain, he sent him letters of safe-conduct, dated like his letter, Feb. 27, 1295.¹

On receipt of this letter, couched in the most friendly terms, Frederick appealed for advice to the people of Palermo. He evidently wanted to know if he had the Sicilians behind him. If he had doubted it for a moment, the reply he received must have reassured him. In a letter of no little length they told him that they had sent trustworthy men to express to him their alarm, lest, if he went to the Pope, he should be cajoled. They impressed upon him how bitterly the Roman Pontiffs had opposed his father, and how their legates with Philip of France had carried war into Catalonia. They had caused Sicily to be attacked, and in the past had raged against "the most illustrious Emperor Frederick II.," against Manfred, and against Conradin. They reminded him how much his father King Peter had done for them, how much his brother James, and how much he himself had done from the time when, called to the crown of Aragon, his brother had entrusted them to him. Let him not trust the promises of the Pope nor fear his threats. God must be with them, or they could not have overcome such powerful enemies. Wherefore they earnestly besought him not to abandon them, but to be sure that his departure from Sicily and that of other nobles would only result in evil. They assured him, in fine, that they themselves and all they had were at his disposal.²

Nevertheless, adds the historian, "the lord Frederick,

Frederick
sails for
Italy.

¹ Ep. ap. *Chron. Sic.*, p. 846 f.

² Ep. ap. *ib.*, p. 848 ff.

wishing to obey the will of the Supreme Pontiff, rather than the advice of the men of Palermo and the other Sicilians, betook himself with the aforesaid nobles" to Italy. Landing at Terracina by Monte Circeo, he went on horseback to Velletri, near which he found the Pope encamped.¹

The Pope's
offer.

Speciale has given us a detailed account of the meeting between the aged Pontiff and the youthful Prince. Captivated by his youthful and splendid appearance, Boniface, like a father, took his head in both hands in order to give him the kiss of peace. Then gazing on his arms and armour, all inlaid with gold, he exclaimed in tender pity: "How well endowed a young man, to have been used to arms from thy tenderest years!" Turning then to the dread admiral Roger Loria, he continued: "And you are the great enemy of the Church who has put so many men to the edge of the sword." "That," promptly retorted the blunt seaman, "is due, Father, to your predecessors and to you."

Thereafter in private, Boniface tried to induce the young Prince freely to renounce Sicily in accordance with the treaty which his brother had made with France. In compensation, he undertook to obtain for him the hand of Catherine, daughter of Philip of Courtenay, and granddaughter of the Latin Emperor Baldwin II., and so heiress to the throne of Constantinople—a lady whose beauty was praised by everyone. He was also promised help in men and money to undertake the conquest of the Empire.²

¹ *Ib.*, p. 250. Boniface was "in campis" at Velletri during part of May and June, 1295. Cf. an Aragonese document on this interview of June 8, ap. Finke, *Mon. A.*, i., p. 28, n. 20.

² *N.S.*, *Hist.*, ii, 21. Cf. *Reg.*, n. 874, June 27, 1295, ep. to Catherine: "Nosque . . . pro ipsius recuperatione imperii eidem Frederico in casu predicti matrimonii contrahendi, magnum pecuniarum subsidium duximus promittendum."

Frederick was dazzled—a beautiful bride and the Empire of Constantinople! But, gallant knight as he proved himself to be, the young man was endowed with a large share of caution. He reflected, says Speciale, that the promises of even great men were not always reliable, but nevertheless agreed to follow the Pope's suggestions, if all the parties concerned would consent.¹

Accordingly, while Frederick sailed back to Sicily, Boniface set himself to persuade Catherine to marry him. Towards the end of June he sent to her, then residing in France, John, abbot of St. Germain des Près, with a letter addressed to "His dearest daughter in Christ, Catherine the illustrious Empress of Constantinople". He began by telling her how since his accession he had laboured to reconcile the Catholic Princes of the world who were at variance with one another. Especially was he concerned to end the struggle between King Charles II., her uncle, and the House of Aragon. After immense difficulty he had brought about an understanding by which he trusted that aid would be forthcoming for the Holy Land, and peace for all Christians, especially for her. Even before he became Pope, he had often thought over her interests, and wondered how the Empire of Constantinople could be recovered for her, and the schismatical Greeks brought back to the bosom of the Church, and to subjection to a Catholic sovereign. Discussing the matter with her uncle, they had come to the conclusion that the best way to accomplish all this was for her to espouse Frederick the brother of King James of Aragon, especially as the latter was engaged to be married to a daughter (Bianca) of Charles. Accordingly taking it for granted that you will be ready to follow my advice, and that of your uncle, he, on your behalf, and proxies on Frederick's behalf, have sworn

Boniface
would make
a match.

¹ *Ib.*

that the said marriage shall be brought about in the ensuing September. He, therefore, exhorted her to agree to this arrangement, and to come to see him regarding it.¹

A little later, July 13, Boniface by letter begged Philip of France to second the proposition he had made to Catherine.²

But, either because the maid was worldly-wise and had ideas of her own on the subject of marriage, or, what is more likely in times when young ladies were not so much their own mistresses as they are to-day, because she was under the influence of Philip, who had his own views as to her matrimonial destiny, Catherine refused the hand of Frederick. As we learn from a letter of the Pope to that Prince, she said very sweetly that it would not be becoming for persons of their quality not to have a home of their own. But Frederick had no land and she had been deprived of her inheritance.³

Although Boniface did not lose hope, but sent fresh envoys to the lady, his scheme did not mature. Catherine ultimately married Charles of Valois, Philip's brother.

Final
ratification
of the treaty
about Sicily.

Meanwhile, negotiations were going on by which it was hoped that the Sicilian question would be definitely settled. After the Pope's consecration, Charles II. remained in Rome⁴ in order that he might be at hand to facilitate the conclusion of a peace which had been hanging fire for some four years, i.e., since the treaty of Tarascon-Brignoles (Feb., 1291) was rendered abortive

¹ *Reg.*, n. 874, June 27, 1295, at Anagni.

² Ep. ap. Du Fresne, *Hist. de l'Empire de Constantinople*, Append., p. 22. Ed. Venice, 1729. See *Reg.*, nn. 803-4.

³ *Reg.*, n. 857, Jan. 2, 1296.

⁴ Charles also went to France for the negotiations. His Registers (*syllabus membranum*, ii, 153-9) show that he was with the Pope at Rome and Anagni till July. When he went to France and returned to Naples does not seem to be known exactly. He was in Rome on

by the death of Alfonso of Aragon.¹ In March (15) Boniface wrote to King James to urge him not to delay sending the plenipotentiaries he had promised, as King Charles was, at his request, awaiting their arrival in Rome or in the neighbourhood.²

Whilst the Pope was sending a legate, Landulf, cardinal deacon of S. Angelo, with full powers into the Kingdom of Sicily (Naples),³ its plenipotentiaries and those of France and Aragon were assembling in Rome. As usual, in order the better to cover their real aims, the envoys, when the peace discussions had begun in earnest, put forward a number of unimportant points. One such was, whether the valley of Aran was to belong to France or Aragon. Boniface succeeded in having this question left over for further discussion, and in effecting an agreement that the district should, in the meanwhile, be put into the hands of William Ferrarius, cardinal-priest of S. Clemente whom he proposed to send thither immediately.⁴ When, too, the proceedings were nearly blocked because the ambassadors of James of Aragon declared that their instructions did not permit them to treat of the restitution by their master of the Balearic

July 4, 1295, and in Naples, Jan. 26, 1296 (*cf. ib.*, p. 159, n.), and we know that by July 3 he had already left Anagni (*cf. Potthast*, 24121), so that he left it about July 1. Meanwhile, on October 30, 1295, he was at Bellegarde in the canton of Beaucaire (M. Riccio, *Saggio Diplom., Supplem.*, pt. i, p. 96 ff.) and at Perpignan on Nov. 7, *ib.*, p. 100.

¹ *Supra*, Vol. XVII, p. 161.

² *Reg.*, 734.

³ *Ib.*, nn. 742-65, Apr. 5, 1295. *Cf. n.* 784.

⁴ See his letters of June 20 and 22 on the subject to Philip of France and James of Aragon. *Reg.*, nn. 162-3. Letters 163-86 treat of these peace negotiations. Lecoy de la Marche, *La France et le royaume de Majorique*, i, p. 344, gives Boniface his due meed of praise for bringing about "la conclusion tant désirée d'une paix générale". Boniface, he adds, "fin diplomate, entreprenant, actif, était bien l'homme qu'il fallait pour accorder entre eux des intérêts si divers."

Isles to James of Majorca, Boniface, on his own authority, decided that they must be restored.¹

The peace of
Anagni,
1295.

At last, on June 21, Boniface was able by a solemn bull, signed by himself as "bishop of the Catholic Church" and seventeen cardinals, proclaiming the terms of peace to which the plenipotentiaries of King Philip, Charles of Valois,² King Charles II., and King James II. had agreed. Ascribing the origin of the trouble between these sovereigns "to the manifest injustice" of Peter of Aragon, who, inciting trouble therein, seized the island of Sicily, "the special territory of the Church," Boniface proclaimed that peace had at length been made. Sicily, as constituted in the time of Charles I., was to be restored to the Church. King James of Aragon was also to give up to Charles his children and other hostages, and the peace between them was to be cemented by marriages.³ On the other hand Philip and especially his brother, Charles of Valois, were to resign all claims to the crown of Aragon and the Pope was with his ring to invest cardinal William in James's name with the kingdoms of Aragon, Valentia, etc., as they had been held by his

¹ *Archiv. nat.*, J. 589, n. 10, ap. Lecoy de la M., *l.c.*, p. 346. After the envoys had pleaded want of powers: "per (Boniface) super restitutione hujusmodi quedam ordinacio facta est, que in litteris ipsius d. Pape que diriguntur dicto d. Jacopo declaratur." Cf. *Reg.*, n. 173 and n. 164, where the Pope says he acted "cum satis expressa conniventia nuntiorum . . . Jacobi." June 20, 1295. See also the actual terms of the treaty between James of Aragon and James of Majorca, where about the chief clause it is stated: "Super isto articulo servetur quod ordinatum est per d. Papam, prout continetur in littera d. Papæ quæ incipit post salutem, *Lætetur*" (the letter just quoted). Ap. Baluze, *Vitæ PP. Avenion.*, ii, p. 18, n. 9, ed. 1693. Cf. also *Reg.*, n. 165.

² Baluze, *l.c.*, p. 18, n. 8, gives the instructions of C. of V. to his envoys.

³ Charles's daughter Blanche was to marry James II. of Aragon.

father Peter.¹ All ecclesiastical censures were to be removed.

In this peace-proclamation no mention had been made of Frederick. However, in less than a fortnight after its issue, Boniface wrote to him in order to give him official notice of the peace, and to ask him to give a kind reception to the archbishop of Messina whom he was sending, now that the island had been restored to the Church, to remove the sentences of interdict and excommunication which had been passed upon its citizens.² About the same time, he told him how he had written to secure the hand of Catherine for him, and that he had sent Guy de Neufville, bishop of Le Puy, to escort her with honour to Sicily. He also told him that King Charles II. with his daughter Blanche (Bianca) and cardinal William of San Clemente had already left Anagni for Catalonia to fulfil the terms of the peace.³

Correspondence with Frederick, 1295.

The spirit in which Boniface conducted all these delicate peace negotiations is well seen in his written instructions to the legate to whom he had entrusted the most difficult task of carrying them through. To those who regard him as merely a worldly statesman not overburdened with scruples, his words will no doubt come as a surprise. "When," he wrote to the cardinal of S. Clemente, "in the course of the execution of the treaty, difficulties arise which may perchance perplex

Instructions to the legate William.

¹ *Reg.*, n. 184, "Splendor glorie." On the following day his bull, "Dilecta pax" (ap. Baluze, *l.c.*, p. 21, n. 10), approved of the treaty between James of A. and J. of Majorca. The last-named author gives also a number of documents dealing with the various restitutions of territory, nn. 11-17. Cf. Potthast, n. 24117 of June 27, where Boniface offers 100 days indulgence to all who will pray for the complete carrying out of the peace.

² Ep. of July 2, 1295. Potthast, n. 24120.

³ Ep. of July 5, ap. *ib.*, n. 24121. As we have seen above, King Charles left Anagni about July 1.

you, turn, as I told you by word of mouth, turn your eyes on Christ, so that with Him you may direct your conscience to the accomplishment of the peace, and to prevent it from being hindered by any obstacle.”¹

Charles in
France.

Arrived in France, at Bellegarde in the canton of Beaucaire,² and gradually travelling south-west to Figueres in Catalonia, King Charles, proclaiming the peace made under the auspices of Boniface,³ busied himself with the carrying out of its details, and in borrowing money from the Holy See (Nov. 7) to enable him to do so.⁴ Meanwhile his son and Vicar, Charles Martel, “the whole hope of the Italians,”⁵ had died in Naples (Aug., 1295).

A new Vicar
for the
Kingdom.

Boniface was deeply grieved at this untoward event,⁶ for the young King of Hungary was everywhere well spoken of; but, as King Charles his father was “in remote parts”, he himself at once nominated as Vicars of the Kingdom the legate, Landulf, cardinal-deacon of S. Angelo, and Charles’s fourth son Philip, prince of Taranto. Neither of them, however, was ever to act without the other.⁷

Learning, however, soon after from trustworthy report, as he said, that the State would be better governed by

¹ *Reg.*, n. 213, June 30, 1295. “Oculos convertens ad Christum, quantum cum ipso poteris confirmare tue conscientie gremium ad id potius quod predictæ perfectioni proficiat quam quod ipsam per obstaculum alicujus ingesti prepedii aliquo modo ledat.”

² In the *arrondissement* of Nîmes (Gard).

³ Oct. 30, 1295, doc. ap. M. Riccio, *Saggio*, vol. ii, pt. 1, p. 9, n. 10. Cf. n. 11.

⁴ *Ib.* Supplements, pt. i, p. 96 ff., nn. 94–7.

⁵ So was he called by Luigi da Piacenza in 1376. See *Archiv. stor. Napol.*, ii, 139, ap. Schipa, *Carlomartello*, p. 139.

⁶ *Reg.*, n. 814, Aug. 12, 1295. At the news of the death: “tanti fuimus dolore cordis intrinsecus (pertacti), et duras pertulimus infra pectoris archana puncturas.”

⁷ *Ib.*

Queen Mary, and that her rule would be more acceptable to the people, Boniface, "on the advice of his brethren, and by the plenitude of his power," named her the sole "vicar-general" of the kingdom. God, he declared, had gifted her with elegant manners, and with affability, prudence, and considerable circumspection.¹

On reading Boniface's declaration regarding the Sicilian peace, one would straightway be disposed to conclude that the great gainer by it was Charles II., and through him the Pope, and the great loser James II. But, as the treaty worked out in practice, all the parties concerned seemed to have profited by it except Charles. It is true that, on the day (Oct. 31, 1295) when he handed over his daughter Bianca to James,² that monarch returned to him his three sons, Robert, Raymond, and John, and the Provençal baronial hostages³; but, though it was agreed that Robert, now the heir to the kingdom of Sicily (Naples) should marry Iolanda (Violante) the sister of James, the Pope had to promise the Aragonese King Sardinia and Corsica for Sicily,⁴ and King Charles had to give Charles of Valois his ancestral county of Anjou, which, adds Muntaner, "is a very important and beautiful

The working out of Boniface's peace.

¹ *Ib.*, n. 824, Aug. 30. The letter is printed in full by Schipa, *Carlo-martello*, p. 164, or by Raynaldus, *Ann.*, 1295, n. 19. Cf. *ib.*, n. 823, of Sept. 5, where he notifies Landulf and Philip of her appointment.

² They were married on Nov. 1. As they were related, Boniface granted them the necessary dispensation, *Reg.*, n. 180, June 23. Sancho IV. of Castile had induced James to take to wife his daughter Mary, and had promised, as they were nearly related, to get a dispensation from the Pope. This he had never done, and James had had no matrimonial connection with her. This is, at least, the plausible story in the *Cronica de S. Juan*, c. 38.

³ Cf. the manifesto of Frederick (Dec. 12) to the Sicilians (important for dates), ap. *Chron. Sic.*, c. 54, p. 853; Villani, viii, 13; Muntaner, c. 181.

⁴ Already in 1294 the Colonna cardinals had suggested that James should seize Sardinia for Sicily. Cf. doc. in Finke, *Aus dem T.*, p. xii.

county " and " a valuable property ".¹ Charles, moreover, had to pay the King of Aragon a very large sum, partly as a dowry for Bianca, and partly as compensation for Sicily.² To meet it, Boniface had to grant his vassal various loans, and for three years the ecclesiastical tithes of France, Sicily, the principate of Achaia, the Duchy of Athens, and the other districts in those parts directly or indirectly subject to Charles, and also those of Italy.³ When to this it is added that Boniface gave James twelve thousand pounds (*Turonesium parvorum*) on condition that he and his officials evacuated the island of Sicily before the time fixed by the treaty,⁴ and that, nevertheless, as we shall see, Frederick and James between them contrived to keep Sicily in their family, it will be evident to what an extent Boniface and Charles were deluded.

The
question of
the island of
Sicily.

In all these negotiations, Boniface had in view not only the cessation of hostilities between the Kings of Aragon, Majorca, and France, but also the bringing back of Sicily under the dominion of the Holy See. But both he and Charles were anxious that the island should be recovered by peaceful means. Even the Sicilians regarded Charles personally as a man who was " very just, gracious, liberal, and kind, much beloved by his vassals, a true Catholic Christian ".⁵ Consequently, in the peace terms, it was laid down that James should indeed evacuate the island,

¹ Muntaner, Villani, *ll.cc.* On the marriage of Robert and Iolanda, see the anon. Sicilian historian ap. Raynaldus, *Ann.*, 1295, n. 21. According to Mariana, *The Hist. of Spain*, l. xiv, c. 10, p. 235, trans. Stevens, " There is still a bull of P. Boniface extant to this effect (the giving of Corsica, etc.), dated the 27th of June."

² See Zurita, *Anales*, v, c. 10, and Raynaldus, *l.c.*, n. 24.

³ *Reg.*, nn. 369-70, July 18; and *Reg.*, 497, Oct. 28, 1295, for Italy. Cf. *Reg.*, nn. 212 and 217.

⁴ *Reg.*, n. 209, July 2, 1295.

⁵ *Chron. Siculum*, p. 6, ed. De Blasiis.

recall all his troops and officials, and command its inhabitants to obey the Roman Church; and that, moreover, should any of his people refuse to leave the island, he was to proceed against them in every way, short of himself making war upon them.¹ From this it is evident that, if the anonymous Sicilian author, quoted by Raynaldus, goes too far in stating that James promised Charles to "give him corporal possession of the island",² Muntaner does not go far enough when he says that James "was not bound to surrender Sicily to King Charles *nor to the Church*, but was to abandon it altogether. The Church or King Charles could take possession of it if they wished, but he was not bound to do anything else."³

It would seem as if both Charles and Boniface had supposed that, when once the Aragonese had left Sicily, its inhabitants, finding themselves abandoned and without a leader, would submit to them at once. Hatred, however, of French rule was too deeply implanted in the hearts of the Sicilians to make them willing to put themselves under it again. Their anxieties grew as the peace negotiations progressed, and they came to a head when it was reported that their sovereign, James of Aragon, had agreed to restore their island to Charles.⁴

They were up in arms at once, and, acting on the advice of Queen Constance, dispatched envoys to James to find out the truth. Understanding from the King that what "report had spread about the renunciation of Sicily" was true, and finding that neither their

The
Sicilians
anxious
about their
fate.

¹ *Reg.*, n. 209 bis, July 3, 1295. "Sine guerra tamen facienda per te."

² *Ann.*, 1295, n. 21. James was to abandon the island, and "Romanæ E. et Carolo II sponte renunciavit et cessit; promisitque C. bona fide . . . in ipsius insule possessionem inducere corporalem."

³ C. 181.

⁴ *Specialis*, ii, c. 22. "Fama volat Jacobum R. Siciliam in manibus R. Caroli renuisse."

eloquence nor the rending of their garments had any effect upon James, they clad themselves in black, and returned with the bad news to Sicily.¹ As Prince Frederick afterwards told its people, it was on Saturday, October 29, that King James, in Villa Bertranda in Catalonia, had informed their envoys that he had renounced any claim he had to Sicily in favour of the Roman Church and King Charles. The envoys had thereupon declared that they no longer owed him any allegiance, and the King had in turn declared that that was true, and that they would therefore understand how they ought to act. He had added that he had no message for Frederick, as he was a soldier, and would know what to do.² At any rate such was Frederick's version of his brother's words.

They elect
Frederick
their King,
1295-6.

That Prince had realized that whoever else was going to profit by the great peace, he stood to lose. September had come and gone, and he had had no news of his promised bride—the heiress of Constantinople. An Eastern throne was evidently merely a dream, Sicily might easily now prove a reality. At meetings at which were present the important men of Sicily, Frederick explained that his brother had renounced his right to rule them, and had handed it over to the Roman Church and “our enemy” Charles.

In order, then, that they might not fall into the hands of a man who, “as all the world knew, was thirsting for their blood,” the nobles and the Syndics of the towns, on

¹ *Ib.*

² The manifesto of Fred. to the Sicilians (Dec. 12), ap. *Chron. Siciliae*, c. 54. On all this see also the *Crónica de San Juan de la Peña*, p. 215, which declares that James said: “My brother F. is governor in Sicily, do as you wish.” From this Chronicle, p. 213, we also learn that cardinal William died at Perpignan in the midst of these negotiations (Sept. 7), and that Boniface replaced him at once by the archbishops of Embrun and Arles. Cf. *Reg.*, 827, Sept. 19.

Dec. 11, meanwhile at Palermo proclaimed Frederick their Lord, and, after other meetings, through the eloquence of Roger Loria and others, their King. He was duly crowned on March 25, 1296.¹

Before the holding of the momentous meeting at Palermo, and before news had reached him of the rebellious attitude of the Sicilians and of Frederick, the Pope had informed him, Queen Constance and others, that he was sending to Sicily the Dominican, brother William, bishop-elect of Urgel, in connection with the treaty of peace (Dec. 8).² However, before the envoy left for the island, word had reached the Pope of the doings at Palermo (Dec. 11). He took action at once. He strove to turn Frederick's mind again to the East by promising him to make renewed efforts to secure for him the hand of Catherine.³ In accordance with the terms of the peace between King Charles and King James, "concluded in our presence, and with our consent," he ordered John of Procida, Roger Loria, the exiles from the kingdom, to leave Sicily in the course of the coming May.⁴ Then, making no mention of Charles, he informed the people of Palermo and Messina that he was going to send them a cardinal as governor, and asked them which cardinal they would prefer.⁵ Meanwhile he sent to the island the bishop-elect of Urgel, and also the Hospitaller, Boniface of Calamandrano,⁶ whom Speciale describes as "a shrewd man of great experience in important negotiations".⁷ But neither the eloquence of Boniface nor the promises of immunities and privileges made by him in

Boniface
strives to
stem the
tide, Jan.,
1296.

¹ *Chron. Siciliae*, c. 54, Specialis, ii, 23, and iii, 1, Mantaner, c. 185.

² *Reg.*, nn. 851-2.

³ *Reg.*, n. 857, Jan. 2, 1296.

⁴ *Ib.*, n. 854, Jan. 2.

⁵ *Ib.*, n. 859, Jan. 2.

⁶ *Ib.*, n. 854.

⁷ *Hist.*, ii, c. 24.

his master's name,¹ produced any effect on the Sicilians. Peter of Ansalone, declaring that all the Sicilians had resolved to crown Frederick their King, drew his sword, and bade him, in their name, leave Sicily under pain of death. "Not being anxious for the martyr's crown, he returned with shame" to the Pope who had sent him.²

He helps
Charles,
1296.

If the cause of Frederick was further helped by the refusal of the Aragonese and Catalonians to obey the summons of James their King and return to Spain,³ that of Charles was supported by the Pope. James was urged to come to Rome as soon as ever it was possible⁴; the legate Landulf was ordered to proceed vigorously, short of inflicting the punishment of death or mutilation, against spies under the guise of religious⁵; and, at Charles's request, he sent him five thousand ounces of gold,⁶ and at the same time offered indulgences to those who were willing to fight against the Sicilians should they attempt to oppose King James's renunciation of the island.⁷ Then on Ascension Day (May 3), after noting what his predecessors Popes Martin IV., Honorius IV., and Nicholas IV. had had to do against the Aragonese and the Sicilians, "rebels and enemies of the Roman Church to whose dominion the island of Sicily is acknowledged to belong," he proceeded formally to declare the acts of Frederick null and void, ordering him and the others

¹ A MS. on Sicilian matters cited by Raynaldus, an. 1296, n. 10, says that the ambassador offered the Sicilians blank sheets sealed with the papal bulla on which they could write such liberties as they desired.

² *Ib.* Cf. ep. of Boniface of May 3, 1296, ap. Raynaldus, *Ann.*, 1296, n. 14.

³ *Ib.*, c. 25.

⁴ *Reg.*, nn. 1560-1, Feb. 5.

⁵ *Ib.*, n. 1571, March 18, 1296, "Citra mortis et mutilationis periculum."

⁶ *Reg.*, n. 1573, March 18, 1296. Cf. nn. 1578-9.

⁷ *Ib.*, n. 1575. Cf. n. 1104, where Boniface granted Charles a respite of a year in the matter of the payment of the annual tax, May 22, 1296.

who had supported his usurpation to appear before him, under pain of excommunication and other penalties, before the octave day of the feast of the Apostles, SS. Peter and Paul.¹

The octave of the feast passed without any sign of submission from either Frederick or the Sicilians. It was left for the sword to settle the rights and wrongs of the matter. James had given orders that all the towns and territories that he held on the mainland of the kingdom of the Sicilies, i.e., in Calabria, for the most part, should be restored to Charles.² His orders, perhaps not meant to be carried out, were not generally obeyed. Charles had to try to recover them by force of arms. Without further ado, Frederick went to the help of the Aragonese garrisons, and his arms met with considerable success (summer, 1296).³

Whilst Boniface, in these emergencies, continued to help Charles by grants of tithes,⁴ and by authorizing him to tax his clergy despite the bull *Clericis laicos*, of which more hereafter,⁵ the King was approaching him with a view to regularizing the succession of his realm. According to generally received notions, the heir to his throne was Carobert, the son of his own recently deceased

War between Charles and Frederick, 1296.

Settlement of the Sicilian succession.

¹ Document of May 3, 1296, ap. Raynaldus, *Ann.*, 1296, n. 14. Among his supporters Boniface names some "De Lombardiæ, Tuscïæ, et regni, ac aliis Italiæ partibus". Cf. *Reg.*, 1655, for the renewal of this declaration. Nov. 18, 1296. It is printed in full in the *Registrum J. de Pontissara*, p. 562 ff., but the English synopsis of its contents is hopelessly wrong.

² Cf. M. Riccio, *Saggio*, Sup. i., n. 98, p. 101.

³ *Chron. Siciliæ*, c. 55, p. 853.

⁴ *Reg.*, nn. 1637, Aug. 1, 1296; 1270, Aug. 19.

⁵ *Ib.*, n. 1467, Dec. 13, 1296. The bull *C.l.*, n. 1567, issued Feb. 24, 1296, forbade the clergy to pay taxes to the civil power without the licence of the Holy See. Hence n. 1467 gave the clergy of the kingdom of Naples "licentiam præstandi sibi (Charles) predictum subsidium sine metu constitutionis nostre super hoc edito".

eldest son, Charles Martel. But Carobert was only a child, and the kingdom had been more or less in a state of turmoil ever since the *Vespers* (1282), and was actually at war with Sicily. Carobert, moreover, was already heir to the kingdom of Hungary. Accordingly, as his second son, Louis, had become a Franciscan, Charles was anxious to have his third son, Robert, now a promising young man of some seventeen years, recognized as heir to the crown of Sicily. To give Robert a position, the King named him his Vicar-General, and commanded all the municipal authorities in the kingdom to send envoys to Boniface to request him to acknowledge Robert, duke of Calabria, their sovereign's heir.¹ Eloquent orators also pleaded the young man's cause. They argued that any son had a better right to succeed his father than the son of the eldest son. The Cortes of Castile had recently decided in that sense in favour of Sancho IV.² After careful examination of the succession laws in the kingdom, Boniface decided that males were to be preferred to females, and those in the first degree to those in the second, i.e., in this case, he decided in favour of Robert.³

James made
standard-
bearer of the
Church, for
a Crusade,
1297.

If even the mainland of the kingdom of the Two Sicilies was to be preserved for Charles, every precaution was necessary, as the arms of Frederick were making steady progress in Calabria. In the beginning of the year 1297, Boniface seemed to be more anxious for the recovery of the Holy Land than for that of Sicily. He therefore agreed to equip galleys for the purpose, induced James of Aragon to do the same, and made him

¹ M. Riccio, *Saggio*, Sup. i, p. 102, Feb. 20, 1296.

² Cf. Baddeley, *Robert*, p. 17, n.

³ *Reg.*, n. 1977, Feb. 24, 1297; in full ap. Raynaldus, 1297, n. 53.

Standard-bearer, Captain-General, and Admiral of the Roman Church for that purpose.¹

However, as time went on, the zeal of Boniface for the recovery of the Holy Land merged into that for the recovery of Sicily. He no doubt realized that Charles was not only incapable of recovering Sicily, but could not even defend the kingdom of Naples. At any rate, he explained to his legates in France that, in order that effective help might be given to the Holy Land, the recovery of Sicily was not merely useful, but necessary. Accordingly, as the good of the Holy Land was his chief aim, he had resolved to build a powerful navy for the recovery of Sicily.²

This change of mind was perhaps due to the arguments of King Charles. We know that he was in Rome with the Pope for some time in the autumn of 1296,³ and again in the beginning of the year 1297.⁴ It was then arranged that Charles should go to France to interview his uncle Philip "on most difficult business", i.e., no doubt, in connection with the trouble which had arisen over the bull "Clericis laicos", and especially with the Siculan affair. Meanwhile, however, he was to remain in Rome to meet James of Aragon whose coming was daily expected, and the Pope was to order his legates in France, the cardinal-bishops, Berard de Got of Albano, and

¹ *Reg.*, n. 2337, Jan. 20, 1297; in full in Lünig, *Cod. Ital. Dip.*, iv, 1379. If he would avoid trouble, the student should note that, by a slip, Potthast has assigned another letter to James (n. 24464) to Jan. 30, 1297, which belongs to Dec. 30, 1297. In the *Register* it is n. 2384.

² *Reg.*, n. 2310, Feb. 9, 1297.

³ He dated documents in Rome on Oct. 20 and Nov. 27, 1296. Cf. *Syllabus Membran.*, vol. ii, pt. i, pp. 174-5.

⁴ *Ib.*, p. 176 and p. 196, n. 2. From that note we learn that Charles was at Aix on June 18, 1297, and back in Naples at any rate by Aug. 12, 1298. Diplomas dated by him at Aix in March, 1298, are to be found on the same page, and from Naples in August 1298, *ib.*, pp. 204-5.

Simon de Beaulieu of Præneste,¹ and certain bankers to have money ready for him when he should arrive there. The bankers, the Clarentes company of Pistoia, were told that, if they had not in hand sufficient money belonging to the Church, they were, in its name, to raise a loan at interest. In view of the military expedition fixed for the summer, it would be both a disgrace and labour lost to the Pope himself and to the Church if the moneys were not forthcoming at the proper time.²

James II. in
Rome, 1297.

Boniface was the more anxious for money as he had to supply James of Aragon as well as Charles. We have seen how, as far back as the beginning of 1296, he was pressing James to come to him; but we can well believe that the Aragonese monarch was not equally anxious to see the Pope. At any rate, in the September of that year, we find him complaining that he had not received the money promised him by Boniface, and asserting that he could not get to Rome without it.³ The fact was that, after the publication of the bull *Clericis laicos*, Philip had forbidden the exportation of gold from his dominions, so that the sums which Boniface had ordered to be sent thence to James did not reach him. However, it is to be presumed that the Pope sent other moneys to him; for, in the beginning of 1297, he began to make serious preparations for his journey to Rome. To convince Boniface that he was in earnest, he sent a peremptory order to his famous admiral, Roger de Loria, to come to

¹ *Reg.*, nn. 2314-15, Feb. 12, 1297.

² *Reg.*, n. 2317, Feb. 9. Cf. *ib.*, nn. 2318-29, and n. 1679, Feb. 28, 1297, about tithes for James of Aragon for the Sicilian expedition. "Precipimus quod per viam mutui cum interesse solvendo per nos et Romanam ecclesiam et per quascumque alias vias et modos quos investigare et tractare poteritis, sic procuretis . . . quod dicta solutio regi facienda . . . convenienti . . . tempore compleatur." N. 2317.

³ Finke, *Mon. A.*, vol. i, n. 22. Valencia, Sept. 29.

him.¹ He also sent word to his mother Constance and to his sister (Iolanda or Violante) to leave Sicily, and meet him in Rome ; and, from a circular letter addressed by Robert, Duke of Calabria and Vicar-General of the kingdom,² to its municipal authorities, we know that they departed from the island on February 25.³

At length, in the month of March,⁴ King James drew nigh to the city of Rome. He was met in great state by King Charles, the cardinals, and the citizens of Rome⁵ ; and, on his arrival in the city, diplomacy at once became very busy. Symbolizing thereby the unification of the claims of the Houses of Anjou, Hohenstaufen, and Aragon to the island of Sicily, Constance gave her daughter Violante in marriage to Robert, the heir of the crown of Naples.⁶ Her son, James of Aragon, besides consenting to this marriage of his sister, protested that the action of his brother Frederick, in seizing the crown of Sicily, was altogether opposed to his wishes ; and, in presence of

¹ *Ib.*, n. 23, Jan. 16, 1297. As printed in Finke, the letter is dated from Rome. There must be some mistake in the dating, either in time or place or both. The Annalist of Aragon (Zurita, v, c. 28) says that James came to Rome at the end of March, and the course of our narrative will prove that his assertion is correct. The next letter of James in Finke, n. 24, is dated Rome, April 5, and his use in it of the term *nuper* (lately) would imply that his communication with Roger was recent.

² Charles so nominated him from Rome on Feb. 7, 1297. Cf. M. Riccio, *Saggio*, Sup., pt. i, p. 106.

³ " Diebus jam octo preteritis ab inde (Sicily) disseserunt (Constance, Violante, Roger de Loria)." Circular of March 4, 1297, printed ap. N. F. Faraglia, *Codice Diplom. Sulmonese*, n. 97. John of Procida also accompanied Constance. Some of the Sicilians were indignant that they were allowed to depart. Cf. Speciale, iii, 20 ; *Chron. Siciliae*, c. 56 ; Muntaner, c. 185.

⁴ Before March 25, because Villani (viii, 18), who begins the year on March 25, ascribes his coming to 1296.

⁵ *Cron. S. J. de la Peña*, p. 217 ; Muntaner, c. 186.

⁶ *Ib.* ; Speciale, iii, 21 ; Paolino Pieri, *Chron.*, p. 60, who, for the same reason as Villani, assigns this to the year 1296.

King Charles, he swore, with his hands in those of the Pope, that, with an army, he would in person help his brother-in-law (Charles) to recover the island.¹ He was perhaps really annoyed that Frederick, acting on the advice of the Sicilians, had refused to meet him.²

James is
crowned
King of
Sardinia and
Corsica.

On his side, Boniface caused Charles to grant full pardon to Roger de Loria for all he had done against him, and to make the redoubtable Catalanian his admiral.³ He took, moreover, the kingdom of James under the special protection of the Holy See,⁴ granted him permission, despite the bull *Clericis laicos*, to receive from religious a proportion of their movables under the name of a gift,⁵ and formally made over to him the islands of Corsica and Sardinia, on condition of homage, military service, an annual payment of two thousand marks of silver, and guarantees of religious freedom for the churches of the island.⁶

Then, in St. Peter's, in presence of a multitude of people who had flocked together to honour the King, Boniface solemnly proclaimed him standard-bearer, admiral, and captain-general of the Roman Church.⁷

¹ Villani, *l.c.* "Giurando in mano del Papa . . . che . . . personalmente con sua forza e gente contro a Don Federigo suo fratello in ajuto del Re Carlo a racquittare la Cicilia."

² Speciale, iii, cc. 12 and 17. Cf. Ep. of James, ap. Finke, *l.c.*, n. 26, dated Civitavecchia, Apr. 13, 1297, in which he commissions Roger de Loria to continue the negotiations, but as the Sicilians made an attempt on his life, his rôle of negotiator soon came to an end.

³ Villani, *l.c.* Whereupon Frederick confiscated his goods in Sicily, and later beheaded his nephew. *Ib.* Cf. Speciale, iii, 22, and iv, 10.,

⁴ *Reg.*, n. 2340, documents of March 16, and April 5 and 6.

⁵ *Ib.*, n. 2341, Apr. 1, 1297. Cf. Finke, *Mon. Ar.*, i, n. 27.

⁶ *Ib.*, n. 2344, Apr. 4, 1297. The oath of allegiance, and the complete list of the conditions of transfer are here given. Boniface declares about the islands: "quod Romanæ ecclesiæ juris et proprietatis existit." Cf. n. 2336.

⁷ "In multitudine copiosa nos magnifice honorante," says the gratified monarch. Finke, *l.c.*, n. 25, Apr. 6, 1297.

Next, "by a golden cup,"¹ he invested him with the kingdoms of Sardinia and Pisa, and in St. Peter's duly crowned him their sovereign.²

In assigning these islands to James, Boniface was simply asserting the universally recognized fact that he was their overlord.³ But he said nothing about the rights of any other in connection with them. Villani, however, implies that the Pisans claimed that the islands appertained to them, and that the Pope made it clear to James that he would have to win them from them or from whoever professed to own them.⁴ Indeed, the Pisan Chronicler, Sardo, contended that in giving Sardinia and Corsica to James as a fief, the Pope was "robbing Pisa to whom it had been confirmed by Alexander IV. when the new Hospital was built".⁵ Boniface would naturally not consider Pisa, because, as we have seen, it had long been in conflict with the Holy See.⁶ Besides he was well within his feudal rights in punishing a disobedient vassal.

About the middle of April, James was on his way back to Catalonia, with his mother Constance, who, says Muntaner, "as the best Christian known in the world,"⁷ had, with John of Procida, spent her time in Rome visiting the Churches, and "seeking to gain indulgences".⁷

¹ *Reg.*, n. 2344.

² Finke, *l.c.* James, of course, did homage to the Pope for the islands. Cf. *Reg. Clem. V.*, vol. viii, p. 352 f., Rome, 1892.

³ Note the comparatively recent declaration to that effect of Rudolf, King of the Romans, ap. Raynaldus, *Annales*, 1275, n. 38.

⁴ "Privilegiollo del Reame dell' Isola di Sardigna, conquistandola sopra i Pisani, o chi v' havebbe signoria," viii, 18. Cf. Paolino Pieri, p. 61.

⁵ *Cronica di Pisa*, ap. *R. I. SS.*, xv, p. 980, or c. 47, in the better ed. in the *Archivio storico Italiano*, t. vi. Sardo wrote about 1400.

⁶ Cf. e.g., *Reg. Nich. IV.*, n. 6840, "Processus contra Pisanos." Nov. 20, 1291.

⁷ *Chron.*, cc. 185-6. It would seem that the assertion of Muntaner that Constance returned to Spain with her son cannot be relied on. She was certainly in Italy in August, 1298. Cf. Finke, *M. Ar.*, i, n. 36, Aug. 1298.

Pisa and
Sardinia.

James
returns to
Catalonia,
1297.

On his return to Spain, James certainly did not display any remarkable energy in preparing for war against Frederick. He did, indeed, by letter to him explain the reasons why he was taking measures against him. The chief one, he said, was from the gratitude which he owed the Pope for what he had done for him, especially for "constituting him among all the other Kings and Princes of the world the General and chief Defender of the Roman Church which is Mother and Mistress of all the Churches". Besides Frederick had refused to meet him. He must, therefore, carry out the commission which had been entrusted to him.¹

This letter is dated "before Lorca" (in obsidione castri de Lorc), and explains very well why James was not ready in this summer, as the Pope and Charles had hoped, to take the field against Frederick. King Sancho IV. of Castile and Leon had died in 1295, leaving his realm to his son, Ferdinand IV., a boy of nine, and the regency to his wife Maria. Among others who took advantage of the youth of Ferdinand was James, and he contrived to seize most of the province of Murcia.²

James in
want of
money, 1297.

This expedition naturally caused him to be still more in want of money, but the bull "Clericis laicos" made it harder for him to squeeze it out of the clergy. He accordingly sent envoys to Boniface, assuring him that he would be ready to begin the campaign against Frederick not later than May next (1298); asking him to allow him to levy the tenth on the military Orders as well as on the others, and to send him the moneys

¹ Finke, *Mon. Aragon.*, i, n. 28, July 5, 1297.

² The Chronicle (*Crónica de don Fernando el IV.*) of the disastrous reign of F. IV. has been published by A. Benavides in vol. i of his *Memorias de D. F. IV. de Castilla*, Madrid, 1869. Cf. Muntaner, c. 187-8, where the reader will find language more curious than truthful; c. 2 of the above *Chron.*, and *Crón. S. J. de la Peña*, p. 216 f.

promised him, and to permit him to put the same interpretation on the bull "Clericis laicos" as he had already permitted Philip of France; and thanking him for helping his reconciliation with Castile.¹ Somewhat later, he asked Boniface if he would create an Aragonese cardinal.²

By this time, it would have become plain to a much less acute person than Boniface, that James was set on getting everything and giving nothing. He, accordingly, pressed to know why, according to the agreement between them, the King had not undertaken the expedition in the summer.³ He also wanted to be informed why even Roger de Loria on the spot had done nothing; but that blunt sailor told King Charles that the reason was because he had found it necessary to await the coming of James, seeing that he had learnt by recent experience that Charles's subjects were much better at eating than at fighting.⁴

Fortunately for the Aragonese King, Boniface was at the moment in the midst of serious trouble with the Colonna cardinals—always too friendly with Aragon, who were in open rebellion against his authority.⁵ There was, therefore, nothing left for him but to accept James's statement that unforeseen circumstances had prevented his acting against Frederick in the summer, and to ratify a fresh convention between him and Charles, by which James was to proceed against Frederick in the ensuing spring with seventy galleys, five hundred knights, and three thousand foot soldiers, all to be drawn from his

¹ "Et el seynor rey ha trames al seynor papa, que li placia, que puxa pendre les cens, axi con el et ses antecessors an acostumat." Finke, *Mon. Ar.*, i, n. 27. With this document of June 7, 1297, cf. n. 30 of Sept. 15, 1297.

² Finke, *l.c.*, n. 32, Dec. 10, 1297.

³ *Ib.*, n. 31, end of October.

⁴ Speciale, *Hist.*, iv, 2. James, too, had suddenly discovered that it was unbecoming that Loria should take command in Calabria! Finke, *l.c.*, n. 29, Aug. 14, 1297.

⁵ See *infra*, ch. vi.

own kingdom.¹ He had also to grant him the tithes and the moneys he wanted,² and to tell him that he prayed God his coming might be speedy, as he was quite distracted with his efforts against "the perfidious cleric and lay Colonnas".³

He would not, however, create an Aragonese cardinal, and was getting so restive with the crooked policy of James that cardinal Matteo Rosso wrote the latter a confidential letter of warning. He pointed out to him, on the one hand, how much the Church had suffered from his father and his two brothers Alfonso and Frederick, and what, on the other hand, Boniface had done for him. To repay the Church and to stop the tongues which are saying that it has trusted you too much, and will in the end be deceived by you, you must not allow trifles to stop you as you did last summer, but must come without fail in the spring. The faithful expect your arrival as though you were a redeemer. If you do not come, not "all the water of the Tiber" will wash you clean of the suspicion that you are trifling.⁴

Arrival in
the Tiber of
James's fleet,
1298.

The representations of the Pope and the cardinal had some effect on James. Frederick, on his side, endeavoured to inspire him with distrust of the court of Rome, and implored him not to make war on a brother. For his

¹ *Reg.*, n. 2188, Dec. 18, 1297, wrongly dated 1296 by the editors of the Register. The new treaty had been drawn up on Oct. 20, 1297, "apud Turolium."

² *Reg.*, 2384 (Dec. 30)-5 (Dec. 31), and 2397 (Jan. 29, 1298).

³ *Reg.*, 2384. "Multisque sumus ad præsens magnis et arduis negotiis occupati, nosque instantia cotidiana sollicitat efficax executio nostrorum processuum contra clericos et laycos Columpnenses perfidos habitorem."

⁴ Ap. Finke, *l.c.*, n. 33, Jan. 2, 1298. In Finke's German summary of this letter, James's coming summer campaign is talked of. In the text the summer campaign spoken of is the one that did not materialize in 1297. On the suspicions of the Roman curia as to the intentions of James, see also *ib.*, n. 35.

part, he was resolved to live and die King of Sicily.¹ But, say the Annals of Milan,² as "James feared the Church more than he loved his brother", he obeyed the papal summons, and his galleys at length appeared at the mouth of the Tiber. With his chief men, he at once made his way to Rome "to get the blessing and money of the Pope".³ James, it is true, was late in arriving, but we are assured that he was honourably received by the Pope who, strangely enough, still appears to have trusted him.

From the Tiber, James sailed to Naples; but it was not till August 24 that with Robert, duke of Calabria, he landed in Sicily to hand over the island to him in his father's name.⁴ Weeks before then we know that the Pope, who was very ill, and the cardinals were anxious to hear what had happened after his departure from Ostia. There was a general expectation that Frederick was coming to Rome to make his submission.⁵ But the fact was that James had no intention of dislodging his brother. Afraid, apparently, to attempt to win over Roger de Loria to his double-dealing, he sent word secretly to Frederick not to attempt to oppose him on the sea.⁶ Still, although with a fine force at his disposal he was making no real progress in the recovery of Sicily, he took

James sails to Sicily, but nothing is done, 1298-9.

¹ *Ib.*, n. 35, March 28, 1298. Frederick "vol vivre e morir rey de Sicilia"

² *Ann. Mediol.*, c. 56, ap. *R. I. SS.*, xvi, p. 684.

³ "Benedictionem et thesauros . . . S. Pontificis recepturus." *Spec.*, iv, c. 3; cf. c. 2, and *Crón. S. J. de la Peña*, p. 220; *Muntaner*, c. 1.

⁴ *Chron. Siciliæ*, c. 59.

⁵ James's procurator to his master, ap. *Mon. Ar.*, n. 36, Aug. 4, 1298.

⁶ *Crón. S. J.*, p. 220: "Notificavit secrele fratre suo F. id quod facere debebat; ipse F. videlicet quod nullatenus apparet coram eo, sed custodiret . . . terram suam . . . cum ipse . . . non accederet occupaturus Siciliam sed serviturus id quod promiserat." Cf. p. 22; *Speciale*. iv, c. 3, and *Mon. Ar.*, n. 38.

good care to impress on Boniface the daily hardships he was enduring ; and, while expecting him even to support his mother, to continue to dun him for money.¹ Once more, too, with all his father's craft, he contrived to regain the confidence of Boniface, who declared that he would rather abandon the world than James,² and sent him Landulf, cardinal-deacon of S. Angelo as a legate.³

Frederick
defeated at
Cape
Orlando,
1299.

The year 1298 passed away, and part of 1299, and James not only had not made any real progress towards the conquest of Sicily, but with the legate, he had, in consequence of a defeat at sea, been forced to return to Naples to refit. However, on the second of July, he again sailed for Sicily, and Frederick, despite another secret warning he had received, was foolish enough to attempt to oppose him on the sea. The result was that the formidable Roger completely defeated him off Cape Orlando (July 4),⁴ and it is said that, but for the connivance of James, Frederick himself would have been captured.⁵

¹ *Mon. Ar.*, n. 37, Oct. 25, 1298. *Re* Constance, whom Boniface at last refused to support any longer, see *ib.*, n. 38, Nov. 5, 1298, before Syracuse—"in obsidione Siracuse".

² Ep. of Gerard, card.-bp. of Sabina to James, ap. *Mon. Ar.*, n. 39, Jan. 28, 1299.

³ *Ib.*, n. 40. Cf. *Chron. Sic.*, c. 59.

⁴ *Chron. Sic.*, cc. 61-3, and especially James's own letter to Boniface about the battle, ap. *Mon. Ar.*, n. 43, July 4, 1299. He professes to regret his relationship with Frederick: "quem O utinam fratrem tacere possem." But the *Crón. de S. J. de la P.*, p. 222, is our evidence that Frederick set out to fight despite his brother's assurance that his kingdom was in no danger from him.

⁵ *Crón. S. J.*, p. 223. The brief *Chron.*, ap. *Archivio Rom.*, 1885, p. 21, is in error when it says that Fred. was captured, but is correct in saying that "James spared his own flesh and blood". Villani, viii, 29, has the same story. He says that Frederick's galley was taken, but allowed to go free. Indeed, it was reported at Barcelona by some "who had come from the Curia that (Roger himself) had written to the Pope to say that, had King James so willed, Frederick would have been captured". See a letter from Barcelona of Aug. 29, ap. *Mon. Ar.*, n. 47.

Letters of congratulation on this overwhelming victory poured in upon James.¹ It was regarded as a glorious Guelf triumph, and, we are assured, caused the greatest joy in Bologna.² Joy at the victory tempered.

But the rejoicing was soon dashed. Though, after the victory, James had assured the Pope that he intended to proceed with the reduction of Sicily,³ he nevertheless soon returned to Catalonia, leaving Robert, Duke of Calabria, in charge of the campaign (Sept.).⁴

Various reasons for his action were, of course, soon current. Some asserted he had returned because Boniface had not given him all the money he had promised.⁵ Others knew he was wanted to restore order in own his dominions.⁶ Others professed to have proof that he had received money from Frederick to withdraw.⁷ To judge from the words of some of the envoys of James at the Curia, it may be supposed that the first was the reason which James wished to be accepted.⁸ Indeed, he said as much himself to cardinal Matteo Rosso.⁹ Whatever amount of money Boniface may have promised James, one can only say that, from the time he began his campaign, the Pope appears to have been constantly engaged in trying to raise money for him, or in actually giving it to him. In October, 1298, Boniface was trying

¹ *Ib.*, nn. 44-5, from various cardinals.

² *Corpus Chron. Bonon.*, ap. *R. I. SS.*, xviii, pt. i, pp. 256-7, new ed.

³ *Mon. Ar.*, n. 43, just cited. "Ad prosequiconem recuperacionis insule predicte sine intermissione ac remissione qualibet . . . devote intendam."

⁴ *Chron. Sic.*, c. 63.

⁵ Cantinelli, *Chron.*, p. 92, new ed.

⁶ *Mon. Ar.*, n. 47.

⁷ *Ib.*, n. 49.

⁸ *Mon. Ar.*, n. 46, Aug. 16, 1299, where Bernard of Fonollar tells James that he was hoping to draw the 10,000 marks "de poder de diable". Cf. James' own statement, ap. *ib.*, n. 48.

⁹ *Ib.*, n. 48, Sept. 1, 1299, from the port of Baia. Cf. n. 50.

to raise money in France to meet his enormous (inexplicabiles) expenses over the Sicilian expedition.¹ On November 1, 1298, in response to the King's request, Boniface authorized the collectors of tithes whom he had appointed in all the lands subject to the Aragonese monarch to pay over to him all the moneys which they had collected or were to collect, seeing that he was faithfully carrying on the affair which he (Boniface) had so much at heart.² In March, 1299, he paid him thirty-two thousand florins of gold off the last ten thousand gold marks which remained out of the hundred-thousand marks of silver which the Roman Church had arranged to give him as a dowry for his queen Blanche. His bankers, the Clarentes of Pistoia, who had advanced him this sum, were authorized to keep all the money coming to them for the Holy See under the title of offerings for the Crusades or any other purpose, till they had recouped themselves for the loan.³ He even, again at James's request, authorized him to issue a debased coinage (monete Jaccensium) which he and certain of his predecessors had sworn never to strike again. But this privilege he only granted on the strict understanding that the majority of his clergy and people agreed.⁴

The
disastrous
expedition of
Philip of
Taranto,
1299.

Besides the departure of King James, another untoward event served to damp the exhilaration excited by the victory off Cape Orlando. Envious of the glory which his brother Robert was winning in Sicily, his younger brother, Philip, prince of Taranto,⁵ resolved, on his own

¹ Potthast, nn. 24727-8.

² *Reg.*, n. 2701.

³ *Ib.*, n. 3001, March 3. *Cf. ib.*, 3067, 3088, June 8, 1299, for a further grant of tithes and legacies of intestates. *Cf. ib.*, nn. 3083, 3091, 3110, all of the same month.

⁴ *Ib.*, 3066, June 8, 1299. "Si . . . majoris partis cleri et populi regni ejusdem ad id accedat assensus."

⁵ *Chron. Sic.*, cc. 62-4.

account, to lead an expedition against Frederick, still as undaunted as ever. As soon as he had heard of this childish idea, Boniface was most indignant, and asked the Prince's brave but incompetent father, Charles, if he was going to suffer all his anxiety, toil, and money, to be ludicrously wasted.¹ But, despite the Pope's repeated prohibitions and threats to cease to give further help for the recovery of Sicily,² Philip had his own way. Disdaining to act in co-operation with his brother Robert, he sailed to the north-west of Sicily, and was promptly defeated and captured at Trapani by Frederick (Dec. 1).³

The indignation of Boniface at the departure of James⁴ was not lessened by this disaster. Had the King remained, it could not have happened. For a moment he thought of taking proceedings against him for having "deceived and betrayed the Church", but he decided that, at the time, the Church "had too many enemies, and the Holy Land was in too desperate a state".⁵ Besides, he was gradually being persuaded, or he gradually pretended to be persuaded, by the legate, cardinal Landulf, and other friends and envoys of James at his court, that the King really could not remain, as among his other difficulties, his troops would not continue to serve unless he satisfied them as to their pay, past, present, and future.⁶ James, on his side too, was anxious not to break completely with Boniface, as he feared he might cause him trouble

⁴ The war in 1300.

¹ *Mon. Ar.*, n. 44.

² *Cf.* Potthast, n. 24882 of Nov. 2. *Cf.* n. 24903 of Feb. 1, 1300.

³ *Chron. Sic.*, cc. 66-7; Muntaner, c. 192, where there is a very lively account of the battle. Villani, viii, 34. *Cf.* ep. of Fred., ap. Testa, *Vita*, n. 21, p. 259, and *Reg. Bon.*, n. 3868, Feb. 1, 1300. *Cf.* n. 3425.

⁴ Charles II. too was, of course, equally indignant. *Cf.* *Crón. S. J. de la P.*, p. 225 f.

⁵ *Mon. Ar.*, n. 49, Oct. 1, 1299. Words of Berengarius of Pavo, the envoy of James at the Curia to his master.

⁶ *Ib.*, n. 50, Oct. 14, 1299, report of the same B. of P. *Cf.* n. 51.

over Murcia. His envoys had reported to him that Boniface had already said that he had no right to it,¹ and that King Ferdinand of Castile, and his mother, the regent Maria, had sent the Pope a number of the famous horses of Castile, and were impressing on him that James had unjustly seized the kingdom of Murcia.²

As the year 1299 drew to a close, there were rumours of peace. Cardinal Gerard had crossed over into Sicily (Oct.),³ and negotiations, unknown at first to the Pope, were opened between Charles and Frederick. When Boniface heard of them, he was very angry with the Neapolitan King, informed him that any agreement come to by him was null, and that if he did not conform to his wishes he would contrive to make a peace with Frederick that would not please him (Jan. 9, 1300).⁴ Boniface was as obstinate in his resolve to subdue Sicily, as Frederick was to defend it. The war accordingly dragged on during the year 1300, while Boniface was occupied in issuing processes against Frederick,⁵ in striving to prevent the Genoese from joining that indomitable hero,⁶ in making grants to prospective allies,⁷ and even

¹ "En que (Murcia) el diu, que no aveu neguna color dedret," *Mon. Ar.*, n. 46, Aug. 16, 1299.

² *Ib.*, n. 50, Oct.

³ *Ib.*, n. 51, Nov. 11, 1299. He had been appointed legate to the two Sicilies on July 20, 1299 (*Reg.*, nn. 3359-3401), with full powers. If the Sicilians returned to the obedience of the Roman Church, they were to be assured that they should be ruled by Italians and not by foreigners. Card. Landulf was associated with him on Aug. 7, 1299. *Reg.*, nn. 3402-4.

⁴ Ep. of Bonif. to C. ap. Lünig, *Cod. Ital.*, iv, p. 451, or *Reg.*, n. 3425. The Pope plainly tells him that, left to himself, experience has shown that he has always managed badly. "Te proprio sensui in arduis innitente, tibi male successit." Boniface goes on to wish that Charles himself had been the only sufferer by his folly! *Cf.* n. 3870.

⁵ Apr. 7 (Holy Thursday), *Reg.*, n. 3879.

⁶ *Reg.*, nn. 3868, 3871, 3880-3, May 1-15, 1300.

⁷ *Reg.*, nn. 3453-8.

in still vainly trying to get James of Aragon to take real action against Frederick.¹ He upbraided him for not following up the great victory off Cape Orlando,² and urged him not to allow his subjects to enter the service of Frederick,³ and to send galleys and men to aid King Charles and Roger de Loria.⁴

Though that great admiral had in the summer gained another naval victory over Frederick off the island of Ponza,⁵ very little progress was made by Robert in Sicily itself, and though, as in 1299, the year 1300 closed with rumours of peace,⁶ the war went on in 1301 in the same indecisive way. During the first half of the year, Boniface was successful in preventing the Genoese from helping Frederick,⁷ but he was mostly occupied in negotiating for a new commander to take control of the campaign in the island.

Towards the close of the year 1300 his legate in Sicily, cardinal Gerard of Parma, had written to impress on Boniface that Duke Robert was not the sort of man to carry on a campaign, and that he must send out a new general if he hoped for success.⁸

Charles of
Valois
invited to
take charge
of the war,
1300.

Fortunately or unfortunately for the Pope, he believed

¹ *Mon. Ar.*, n. 58, May 13, 1300.

² *Reg.*, n. 3427, Jan. 15, 1300. "Numquid potest detestabilis error haberi dum . . . magna tibi desuper collata victoria contra hostes, illa, ob tuam vel morum aut utrorumque culpam, uti regali constantia neglexisti?"

³ *Ib.*, cf. *Mon. Ar.*, n. 54, about the beginning of March, 1300.

⁴ *Reg.*, 3427. Cf. *Mon. Ar.*, n. 57.

⁵ *Chron. Sic.*, c. 69; *Speciale*, v. 14.

⁶ An envoy writing to James, Dec. 1, 1300, says: "De facto Sicilie, credo quod terminetur cicius quam gentes credant."

⁷ *Reg.*, nn. 4324-5 and 4337, June 1, 1301. Cf. nn. 4119-20.

⁸ "Messer Gerart de Parma . . . ha escrit al senyor papa, que el Duch no es hom, qui vale re a obs de guerra ne de batala ne fer conquesta . . . per que lo senyor papa ha auda volontal de trametre en Sicilia altre capitani." Report of his envoy Abbot Gaufridus, ap. Finke, *Aus den Tagen*, p. xx, Dec. 7, 1300.

that he had found the very man—the enterprising Charles of Valois. The latter's wife, Margaret, the daughter of Charles II., whose dowry had brought him the counties of Anjou and Maine, had died on the last day of 1299,¹ and it was not long before he tried to replace her by Catherine, the claimant of the throne of Constantinople. The lady was willing, but was related to Charles. He accordingly applied to Boniface for the necessary dispensation. Anxious to obtain all the help he could for the conquest of Sicily, Boniface promised to grant it on condition that Charles would come to the assistance of the Roman Church and his father-in-law, King Charles II., within the fortnight following the feast of All Saints (1300),² or, as was agreed later, by Candlemas Day of the following year.³ To this Charles readily agreed, and the Pope granted the dispensation, promised monetary aid,⁴ and agreed to proclaim solemnly the rights of Catherine to the throne of Constantinople.⁵

Charles of
Valois comes
to Italy,
1301.

The marriage duly took place (Jan. 28, 1301), and in August, in order to raise money for the new Sicilian campaign, Boniface imposed tithes on all Italy, and on all the territories of Charles II. for three years, declaring

¹ Cf. J. Petit, *Charles de V.*, p. 55.

² Potthast, nn. 24935–6, Apr. 1, 1300.

³ Ep. of Oct. 3, 1300, ap. Du Cange, *Hist. de Constantinople*, Doc. n. 11, pp. 24–5.

⁴ Potthast, n. 24972 (Aug. 12, 1300). Cf. Finke, *Aus den Tagen*, docs. 4 and 5, Nov. 2, 1300, p. xv ff., and Muntaner, c. 193; Speciale, vi, 7. See Potthast, 24992 (Nov. 21, 1300), wherein Boniface tells the French clergy why he has summoned Charles, and begs them to bear the burden of taxation with patience. When Sicily has been recovered, it will be easier to help the Holy Land. In Ireland, as late as 1302, it is recorded that “the tenths of all benefices were exacted by the Pope in aid of the Church against the King of Aragon”. No doubt the chronicler has mistaken James for Frederick of Aragon. James Grace, *Annals of Ireland*, p. 46.

⁵ Potthast, n. 25071.

that the man who had no care of his household practically denies his faith and is worse than an infidel.¹

Charles, with a number of French nobles and some five hundred men-at-arms, reached Anagni, where Boniface was then residing, in September,² and on the third of that month was declared by the Pope, who had given him a warm welcome, Captain-General of all the territory subject to the temporal jurisdiction of the Roman Church,³ and during the vacancy of the Empire "Pacifier" (Paciarius) of Tuscany.⁴ At the same time extensive grants of tithes were made to him.⁵ A little later (Sept. 14), he solemnly proclaimed that Charles's wife had not lost her right to the throne of Constantinople.⁶

Besides the Pope, Charles of Valois (or Anjou) also met at Anagni, King Charles and his sons. After a ^{Conference at Anagni, 1301.} careful discussion of the situation, it was decided that a great armament should be prepared, and an overwhelming attack made on Sicily in the coming spring (1302).⁷

"Desirous that Charles (of Valois) should not pass the winter to no purpose," Boniface "gave him the title of Peacemaker of Florence", and sent him to that city in order to heal the disastrous split there in the Guelf ranks, due to the White and Black factions (the Bianchi and the Neri).⁸

¹ *Reg.*, n. 4127, Aug. 30, 1301.

² Villani, viii, 48 (al. 49). Charles II. arrived in Anagni, in August. Finke, *Quellen*, n. 7.

³ *Reg.*, n. 4392, but in full in Theiner, *Cod. Dip.*, i, 553. Cf. *Reg.*, n. 4394; Finke, *Mon. Ar.*, n. 71.

⁴ *Reg.*, n. 4393, T., n. 554. Boniface had not recognized the election of Albert of Austria as King of the Romans. Cf. Ptolemy of Lucca, *Annal.*, p. 1304. In Finke, *Quellen*, n. 8, may be read the address of Boniface on this occasion. Charles of V. was another Judas Machabeus.

⁵ *Reg.*, nn. 4395-7.

⁶ Potthast, 25071, Sept. 14, 1301.

⁷ Villani, *l.c.*

⁸ *Ib.* Cf. Finke, *l.c.* He sent him to make peace between our sons "qui dicunt se nigros et albos". See p. xxxi for grant of money for his expenses by the Pope.

Charles of
Valois' failure in
Florence,
1301-2.

Charles accordingly marched north, and entered Florence (Nov. 1, 1301). As we shall see later, he only made "confusion worse confounded",¹ and left the city after having done more harm than good (Feb., 1302).²

The Sicilian
expedition of
Charles of
Valois, 1302.

Whilst he had been mismanaging things in Florence, his namesake in Naples, with money obtained "from our lord the Supreme Pontiff and our friends", had prepared a large fleet and army. With these and his own followers, Charles, who had been named by his father-in-law Captain-General of the Island of Sicily, set out for it in company with Robert duke of Calabria and his brother Raymond Berenger in the month of May.³

Gossip of the
Curia.

It need not be said that, before this final effort for the reduction of Sicily was launched—an effort in which we are told that Boniface put forth "his powerful right arm",⁴ there were endless negotiations. Of those that were held in the presence of Boniface some rumours have reached us, principally from the reports sent to King James II. of Aragon by his envoy (procurator), Geran or Gerald de Albalato, archdeacon of Muruedre.⁵ His reports show him to have been a very obsequious personage on the look out for promotion. "His littleness

¹ Ptol. of L., *ib.*, says there was much disturbance there, and such destruction of property whilst he was in the city "qualis non fuit a tempore quo Guelfi et Gibellini Florentiæ fuerunt".

² Villani, viii, 49 (al. 50). V. says that Charles left the city in April, but Aragonese envoys in Rome say he entered Rome on Feb. 19 or 20. Cf. Finke, *Quellen*, pp. xlii and li.

³ Finke, *l.c.*, p. li, cf. p. xlvi; Riccio, *Studii stor. fatti sopra 84 Reg.*, pp. 113-14. For papal loans to Charles II., cf. *Reg.*, n. 4128, Sept. 11-n. 4131, Sept. 29, 1301.

⁴ Report of the archdeacon Geran de Albalato to James II., ap. Finke, *Aus den T.*, p. 1.

⁵ They are to be found in Finke, *A. de T.*, and *Mon. Ar.*, and have been set down as "lettres aussi pleines de malice presque et de finesse qu'en d'autre temps celles des ambassadeurs venitiens". Cochin, *Jubilés*, p. 89.

kisses the earth in the King's presence,"¹ and he is but "dust and ashes".² Still he prefers prison to not doing the King's will,³ and hopes for benefices "and other greater favours" from his master.⁴ He is just the sort of man who would transmit to his sovereign such stories as he knew he would be glad to hear. Accordingly he is constantly telling James stories he has heard from the "big wigs" of the Curia—"magni canes de curia", as he calls them, about the quarrels between Boniface and King Charles about money and the conduct of the Sicilian affair. He represents Boniface as having unbounded contempt for Charles II., and showing it by constantly addressing harsh and abusive words to him.⁵ He was fitter to play dice than make war.⁶ However, as far as abuse of Charles is concerned, the court scandal on this subject reported by Gerald is repeated in a notice of the Curia's doings sent by Laurentius Martini to his bishop, Raymond of Valencia.⁷

Boniface himself is declared by Gerald to be "a man wonderful in all his works", who wanted to do only what pleased himself, and who detested the interference of the cardinals, regarding reference of a matter to them in consistory as a knife plunged into his body.⁸ Hence the cardinals are said to have declared: "It is better to die than live with such a man! He is all tongue and eyes, but (alluding to his gout and other complaints), as the rest of him is rotten, he won't last long. . . . We have the very devil to deal with."⁹ Many of the cardinals wished he were dead, and said all manner of hard things against Arnold of Villanova, who was credited by Boniface himself

¹ *Aus.*, p. 1.² *Ib.*, p. xxxiv.³ *Mon. Ar.*, p. 105.⁴ *Aus.*, pp. xxx, xxxv, lvi.⁵ *Mon. Ar.*, pp. 101, 104.⁶ *Aus.*, p. xxxiii. The editor, Finke, frankly declares that he does not believe that Boniface used such language. Cf. p. li.⁷ *Ap. Aus.*, p. xxxviii ff.⁸ *Mon. Ar.*, p. 104; *Aus.*, xxvii and xxix. ⁹ *Mon. Ar.*, p. 104.

and others with having restored him to health.¹ The Pope, Gerald assured his master, who we shall see does not appear to have believed all that his agent told him, is intent only on three things, living a long time, getting money, and advancing his family. For things spiritual he has no concern.² He also assured him that Boniface was always declaiming against him, on the grounds that he could easily have made Frederick give way if he had wanted, and could have captured him off Cape Orlando if he had been so minded.³

Dissensions
before the
last
campaign of
1302.

Before the sailing of the last expedition against Sicily (May, 1302) the dissensions between the Pope and Charles became greater. According to Gerald's reports, all wanted peace except the Pope.⁴ On March 4 there was a regular wordy battle between the latter and the King. Boniface, says Martini, roundly abused Charles. He was not a man, but merely a worthless ribald. If he did not support him the earth would swallow him up. Whereupon Charles retorted that the Pope was always blaming him without reason, and that he could not stand it any longer. Don't you know, exclaimed the angry Pope, that I can take your kingdom from you? No! I do not know it, answered the King. He then left the Pope's presence, and would not see him again for nine days. However, through the exertions of Charles of Valois, cardinal Matteo Rosso, and Theodore, bishop of Orvieto, the two were reconciled.⁵

¹ *Aus.*, pp. xxxi and xxxiv. "Breviter, domine, omnes desiderant mortem suam, et dolent de dyaboliis quas facit et dicit."

² *Aus.*, p. xxxi. For money-grabbing see also pp. xxvii-viii-ix. On advancing his family see what he says about his efforts to get Gaeta for his nephew, p. xlv, xlix.

³ *Mon. Ar.*, p. 102; *Aus.*, pp. xxxvi, liii. "Potuisset michi dedisse pacem et non dedit." P. xxxiv.

⁴ *Aus.*, pp. xlv-vi. This is from Martini's *Diary*.

⁵ *Aus.*, pp. xlv-vi. Cf. also Gerald, p. li.

Charles's son, too, Robert, duke of Calabria, tried, on his own account, to make peace with Frederick, and Gerald gives the rumour that, had the latter not received the Pope's bitter enemies, the Colonnas, peace would have been concluded.¹ As it was, both the Pope and Frederick himself rejected the duke's proposals.²

One can scarcely suppose that there is no truth in all this court gossip. But, if Boniface used all the hard words assigned to him, when we hear that his feet were so swollen with gout that it was torture for him to sit out a consistory meeting,³ and that he was suffering from stone at the same time,⁴ there can be no difficulty in finding some excuse for him.

However, if it be the fact that he was the chief obstacle to the conclusion of peace with Sicily, he was soon to find that he could not offer a strong enough resistance to it.

Peace of a
Caltabellota,
1302.

The expedition under Charles of Valois proved a complete failure. The summer heats engendered disease among the troops, and Charles concluded a peace with Frederick, known as the Treaty of Caltabellota (Aug. 29, 1302).⁵ By it Frederick was to remain King of Sicily, though he was to be called not King of Sicily, but only "Frederick III. by God's grace King". He was to give up to Charles II. the places he held in Calabria, and the Duke of Calabria was to cede to him Catania and the other places which he held in Sicily. Frederick was to

¹ *Ib.*, p. lvi.

² *Ib.*, p. lii.

³ *Ib.*, p. xxvii. "Nec eciam poterat esse diu in consistorio ostendendo eis pedes, quomodo erant grossi."

⁴ *Ib.*, pp. xxx and xxxvi. Boniface, according to Gerald's report, maintained that Arnold of Villanova had taken away the pain of the tone by certain metal seals, etc., which he had made for him, as some people now wear metal rings to cure rheumatism.

⁵ Ptol. of L., *Ann.*, p. 1305; Muntaner, cc. 193, 197-8; Specialis, vi, 3, 10, 17; *Chron. Sic.*, c. 70.

marry Eleanor, "who," says the gallant Muntaner, "was and still is the wisest and best Christian lady in the world, except only my Lady Blanca, her sister, Queen of Aragon". Eleanor (or Leonora) was the third daughter of Charles II., and it was agreed that, on the death of her husband, the island should revert to the heir of Charles II.¹ All ecclesiastical censures were to be removed, all prisoners to be released, and Frederick was to be acknowledged King by the Pope. The heroic Aragonese was the sole gainer by the great struggle, for the only condition adverse to his interests that was kept was the surrender of the places he held on the mainland. It was a great misfortune for Boniface that he did not understand the man and the people against whom he was struggling. Cardinal Gerard formed a much more accurate estimate of Frederick. He was always praising his industry and prudence to the Pope and the cardinals. He even declared that, if the Church would but acknowledge him as King of Sicily, it would find that it had a more devoted subject than King Charles. He declared that, whenever Frederick took an oath, he always added: "So may God grant me the favour of the Roman Church." Boniface, however, would not listen to his legate, but bade him say no more to him in Frederick's praise.²

Boniface
ultimately
accepts the
peace,
1302-3.

Nevertheless when the peace of Caltabellota was reported to him, Boniface would appear to have been glad that the struggle was over. At any rate, though he said

¹ Frederick and Eleanor's heir was to be compensated by the gift of the kingdom of Cyprus or one of similar value, or by a money equivalent. Cf. *Reg.*, n. 5348, *Rex pacificus*, of May 21, 1303, which gives the treaty at length. See also Ptolemy of Lucca, the Paduan version of *H.E.*, lib. xxiv, p. 1222. P. of L. says he got the terms of the treaty: "ab illo qui fuit mediator." He also adds that the treaty was not kept, as Frederick still holds the island.

² Finke, *Quellen*, p. lv. This is again only Gerald de A.'s report.

at first that he could not ratify the peace, he at once (Dec. 6) removed from Frederick the sentence of excommunication in order to facilitate the final conclusion of the treaty.¹ He also granted the necessary dispensation for his marriage with Eleanor, and made it clear that, if Frederick would agree to the reasonable amendments to the treaty which he proposed, all would be well.²

It may, indeed, have been that the acute stage to which his differences with Philip the Fair had at this date arrived, also helped to decide Boniface to accept the treaty. However this may be, he finally ratified the treaty (May 21, 1303), after Frederick's envoys had accepted his modifications of it.³ In their master's name they agreed that he should hold the island as the Pope's vassal, paying an annual tribute of three thousand ounces of gold, and, on demand, furnishing a hundred men-at-arms for the service of the Roman Church.⁴ Frederick was to show himself a true vassal, by regarding the Pope's enemies as his enemies, by helping the cause of the Holy Land, and by allowing free trade intercourse between Sicily and Rome. It was, further, finally agreed, with the consent of King Charles II., that Frederick's title should be "King of Trinacria", but that Charles should retain the title of King of Sicily.⁵

With the formal removal of the interdict from Sicily (June 2, 1303),⁶ the relations of Boniface to Frederick and *Trinacria* may be said to have ceased, for he died a few months after. As the latter did not fulfil the conditions imposed by Boniface, the "King of Trinacria" was the sole gainer by the peace, while Charles of Valois,

¹ *Reg.*, nn. 5070-6. ² *Reg.*, n. 5072, Dec. 6. ³ *Reg.*, n. 5348.

⁴ *Ib.* "Et erit vassallus et censuarius ipsius ecclesiæ."

⁵ *Ib.* Cf. *Reg.*, n. 5362, May 21, 1303, whereby the tribute payable by Charles II. was reduced by the amount to be paid by Frederick.

⁶ See the bull "Illius exemplo", ap. *Chron. Sic.*, c. 71. Cf. *Specialis*, vi, 18.

says Villani, returned to France in November with but little honour and less resources. Men sneeringly said of him that he went to Tuscany to make peace, and left it at war, and went to Sicily to make war, and left it under a disgraceful peace.¹

But if the Sicilian question was settled for the moment and completely, as far as Boniface was concerned, it was anything but finally settled. Robert, whom, when King, Petrarch regarded as "the honour of France and the ornament of Italy", was not satisfied with the peace, and Frederick's non-fulfilment of its conditions caused a fresh outbreak of hostilities. But the Aragonese dynasty maintained itself till its position with regard to the Holy See and Naples was finally recognized in 1372, and till in 1435, in the person of Alfonso V., King of Aragon and Sicily, it gained the kingdom of Naples or Apulia itself.

THE HUNGARIAN SUCCESSION.

Claim of
Carobert to
Hungary,
1295.

As the Angevins of Sicily were destined to give Kings to Hungary, we must here relate what Boniface did to support the claim of Carobert to the Hungarian crown. We have already told how Nicholas IV. supported the claim of Charles Martel to Hungary against that of Andrew III.² On the death of Charles (1295), his rights passed to his son Charles Robert or Carobert. Despite all his efforts and intrigues, Charles II. completely failed to make good his son's claim, but he was to do for his grandson what he had not succeeded in doing for his son. The first movement, however, in Carobert's behalf came from Hungary itself. Some discontented nobles, representing themselves as spokesmen for the whole

¹ *Chron.*, viii, c. 49 (al. 50). Cf. Will. of Nangis, *Chron.*, p. 323 and 333. He says Charles returned to France in Feb., 1303.

² *Supra*, Vol. XVII, p. 172.

country, implored Boniface to send Carobert to them, as the whole land was suffering from the vices of the usurper Andrew. This Boniface the more readily believed as the malcontents had with them the metropolitan of Hungary, the archbishop of Strigonium (Gran).¹ He accordingly proclaimed the boy Carobert, aged eleven, King of Hungary (1299).² Charles II., following up the action of the Pope, knighted his grandson, and in August, 1300, sent him off to Hungary under the care of distinguished churchmen and soldiers.³

According to the Chronicler of Hungary, Boniface sent one legate after another to prepare the way for the youthful King; but we are assured that they were not able to effect anything. However, the death of Andrew "on the feast of St. Felix", Jan. 14, 1301, put a new complexion on the state of things.⁴ A large number of the Hungarian magnates at once elected Ladislaus, the son of Wenceslaus, King of Bohemia, had him crowned by John, archbishop of Kalocsa († c. Oct., 1301), at Alba, and conducted to Buda (July-Aug., 1301). This they did, according to Thwroc, lest, by admitting the candidate sent by the Church, they might lose their liberty of electing their ruler.⁵ But as other magnates had undertaken not to obey anyone as their King

¹ See the letter of Boniface to George, the archbp. elect of Gran (Jan. 28, 1299), in which he exhorts him to assemble the clergy and chief men of Hungary to put down heresy and those who are disturbing the peace of the kingdom. Ap. Theiner, *Mon. Hung.*, i, p. 384, n. 617. Cf. Katona, *Epit. Chron. rer. Hung.*, i, pp. 551-2.

² Thwroc, *Cron. Hung.*, cc. 82-3, pp. 80-1.

³ Cf. M. Riccio, *Genealogia di Carlo II.*, pp. 31-4, from the Angevin Archives, Naples, 1882; Katona, p. 552.

⁴ Th., *l.c.*, 83. There are many saints of the name of Felix, and some authors suppose this one to be Pope Felix III., and so give the date as Feb. 25. But the addition of the words "*conf. in Pincis*" in the Buda Chronicle shows that the Felix in question is the one whose feast is kept on Jan. 14. Cf. Katona, *l.c.*, p. 553, c. 459.

⁵ *L.c.*, c. 84.

except he had been approved by the Holy See, the country was divided.¹

Nicholas of
Ostia sent as
legate, 1301.

Meanwhile, on May 13, 1301, Boniface, anxious, as he said, that "all Christ's faithful should enjoy peace and quiet", commissioned Nicholas, cardinal-bishop of Ostia and Velletri (afterwards Benedict XI.), to go as legate to the distracted country. He told him how distressed he was at the miserable state of the realm, and how gladly he would, if possible, go to the land on which his thoughts so constantly dwelt.² However, as that under the circumstances was impossible, he has decided to send him in his place, although his wise counsels are very necessary for the Holy See, for he knows his knowledge, prudence, industry, and fortitude. He sent him, he said, as "an angel of peace" to restore ecclesiastical liberty and peace, and to work for the uplifting of the poor ("ad relevationem pauperum").

Sharp letter
to King
Wenceslaus.

When, however, Boniface heard of the election of Ladislaus he was greatly annoyed, and vented his displeasure in a very straight letter to his father Wenceslaus (Oct. 17, 1301). He wrote plainly because, on the one hand, he was convinced that the Hungarian monarchy was not elective, and because, on the other, Philip of France was vigorously attacking that position of Overlord of Christendom which had hitherto been generally conceded to the Popes.

He blamed Wenceslaus for allowing his son to be elected King of Hungary, and for permitting him to be crowned, and that too by one who had no right to do so. To act in that way was to despise the Holy See, the

¹ Count John "Ferrei Castri", e.g. had promised: "ita quod nulli tanquam Regi Ungarie pareret aut intenderet seu obediret nisi destinato seu approbato a sede predicta." Ep. of Boniface, March 13, 1299, ap. Theiner, *Mon. Hung.*, i, p. 385, n. 618.

² Ep. ap. *ib.*, n. 619. "Ut ubi mente vigilanter intendimus, ibi presentialiter nostrum desiderium panderemus."

mother and mistress of all, who, at least, in all doubtful cases of importance, ought to be consulted. The first ruler of Hungary, St. Stephen, had humbly received his crown from the Holy See. But now the noble kingdom of Hungary, devastated by the Tartars, has been thrown into still greater disorder by the action of John of Kalocsa. He begged the King to listen to the legate whom he has sent, and, if he and his son have any rights in Hungary or elsewhere, to lay them before the Holy See.¹

On the same date he wrote to the legate Nicholas to order archbishop John to come to Rome within four months in order to defend or explain his usurpation of the rights of others. In this letter he set forth his own position in language by no means ambiguous. "The Roman Pontiff has been placed by God Himself over Kings and Kingdoms, and in the Church militant he has been put by Him in the first position; and so with power (*principatum*) over all men, sitting in the seat of judgment, he notes, condemns, and confounds all evil." In their care, then, for kingdoms, the Roman Pontiffs have had special care for Hungary, as "pertaining to the Holy See in a more special way".

Now, since your departure, he continued, addressing the legate himself, word has reached me that the archbishop of Kalocsa, usurping the rights of the archbishop of Gran, has ventured to crown the son of the King of Bohemia as King of Hungary. This was the more unjustifiable, seeing that Ladislaus² had no claim to the throne by right of succession or any other, and that Carobert, the grandson of Charles II., had already been crowned by the archbishop elect of Gran. Moreover, he ought to have known that, as documents preserved in the archives of the Roman Church prove, King Stephen

¹ *Ib.*, n. 621, p. 387.

² Boniface calls him, not Ladislaus, but, like his father, Wenceslaus.

devoutly offered the kingdom of Hungary to the Roman Church.¹

Failure of
the Legation,
1303.

The legate seems to have had hopes of a successful termination to his mission. Though he had to report that both the archbishops, the elect of Gran and the incumbent of Kalocsa, were unsatisfactory, and that the majority of the bishops were opposed to the latter, he was also able to report that he had heard that the rival kings had come to terms, that he had been well received, and that he had summoned the bishops of Hungary to meet him within the octave of St. Luke (Oct. 18).² But his hopes proved to be ill-founded. He could not induce the bishops to accept Carobert, who, however, say the *Annals of Austria*, encouraged by some of the more powerful nobles, awaited his chance "in the extreme parts of Hungary".³

The
claimants
summoned
to appear
before
Boniface,
1302.

Meanwhile, acting on instructions received from the Pope,⁴ the legate summoned Queen Maria and her grandson, and Wenceslaus and his son to appear before Boniface within six months in order to lay their respective claims to the kingdom before him.⁵ It must be remembered, said the Pope both to Wenceslaus and to Nicholas, "that the throne of the Apostolic Majesty has been by Our Lord set over kings and kingdoms in order that the rod of equity may render to everyone

¹ Theiner, n. 622, *Reg.*, n. 4400 ff. Cf. n. 623, written some weeks later (Nov. 8), to King Wenceslaus to exhort him to help the legate to make peace; for he has heard the most lamentable stories of the state of the country. See also n. 624.

² Cf. the letter (n. 626, Nov. 8, 1301) of Boniface to him.

³ *Ann. Aust., contin. Zwetl.*, ap. M. G. SS., ix, p. 660. Cf. ep. n. 628 (June 10, 1302) of Boniface, in which he acknowledges the failure of his legate's mission up to that time: "Quinimo guerrarum turbines in regno . . . invalescunt."

⁴ Cf. nn. 628-9, ap. Theiner, of June 10, 1302.

⁵ *Ann. Aust., cont. Vindobon.*, ap. M. G. SS., ix, p. 721. Cf. ep. of Boniface, n. 635.

his due, may right the wrong, and apply sharp remedies to those diseases that reject a mild cure." ¹

Unable to make any substantial headway in Carobert's behalf, and alarmed by the hostile attitude of the supporters of Ladislaus, the legate returned to Italy by Vienna, and gave Boniface a report of his doings.²

Within the period named by the Pope, plenipotentiaries from Maria and her grandson duly presented themselves before a tribunal composed of Boniface himself, the cardinals, and a number of bishops and clergy from Hungary. But, as merely frivolous excuses for absence were presented on behalf of Wenceslaus and his son, the Pope "after solemn examination of the case with his brethren", declared in favour of Maria and her grandson, chiefly on the ground of hereditary right, as it was proved that in Hungary the succession was regulated, not by election, but by descent.³ Consequently all, clergy and laity alike, who opposed them were threatened with excommunication. Nevertheless, the pontifical decision, declaring itself mindful of the mature gravity becoming the sentences of the Apostolic See, gave the King of Bohemia and his son four months during which they could set forth any claims they might have to proprietary rights within the kingdom of Hungary.⁴

A few days later Boniface exhorted Maria and her little grandson to do all that was possible for the

¹ A passage in both the letters, nn. 628-9. Incidentally, in the one to Wenceslaus, n. 628, he blamed him for assuming the title of King of Poland in contempt of the rights of the Holy See "to which the Provinces of Poland are known to pertain".

² *Ann. Aust., cont. Zwellen.*, p. 660, and *cont. Sancruc.*, p. 733. Cf. ep. Bonif., n. 635, May 31, 1303, where the verbal report is alluded to.

³ Ep., n. 635, of May 13, 1303. He decided for the Angevins "Eo maxime, quod sicut scripti canonis series aperiet, Regnum ipsum Ungarie successionis jure provenit."

⁴ "Ceterum; ut que gravitati sedis apostolice congruunt, cum debita maturitate servemus, nec excludamus a nostris processibus amicam in throno sedentibus equitatem, etc." *Ib.*, p. 399.

Boniface
proclaims
the rights of
Maria and
her
grandson,
1303.

amelioration of the condition of "the lacerated kingdom of Hungary",¹ begged Albert, King of the Romans, and his son Rudolf, duke of Austria, to help them against Bohemia,² bade the clergy and laity of Hungary obey them,³ and instructed certain bishops to publish his award in Bohemia.⁴

Though Boniface received notices from Cathedral Chapters and Bishops⁵ that his sentence had been duly published, as he had prescribed, he did not live to see Carobert undisputed King of Hungary. Finding that his supporters were falling away from him, Ladislaus left the country in 1304.⁶ In the following year, however, another candidate for the Hungarian crown appeared in the person of Otho, duke of Bavaria, whose mother, Elizabeth, was the daughter of Bela IV. He was crowned at Albaregia (Dec. 6, 1305), but, after having been captured (1307) and imprisoned, he was glad to give up all claim to the country (1308).⁷ At length on Dec. 31, 1310, Carobert was crowned at Alba and universally recognized as King of Hungary.⁸

The country owed a lasting debt of gratitude to Boniface; for, as a modern Hungarian author has put it, under the rule of the Angevins, "the culture and customs of Western Europe gradually took root in Hungarian soil. The name of Hungary became the object of respect and admiration abroad, and the boundaries of the kingdom were so extended . . . that, as the Hungarian poet Bajza sings: 'the shores of three seas formed the frontier walls of the kingdom.'"⁹

¹ *Ib.*, nn. 636-7, of June 3, 1303.

² *Ib.*, n. 639, June 11.

³ *Ib.*, n. 640, June 11.

⁴ *Ib.*, n. 638, June 11.

⁵ *Ib.*, nn. 641-5, July 30-Sept. 9, 1303. Cf. Katona, *l.c.*, ii, c. 5, p. 8.

⁶ Katona, p. 10.

⁷ John Victoriensis, *Hist.*, lib. iii, vol. i, p. 332, and notes thereto; ed. Schneider, 1909.

⁸ Thwrocz, *Chron.*, pp. 82-3. Cf. M. Riccio, *Geneal. C. II.*, p. 35 f.

⁹ A. Vambéry, *Hungary*, pp. 151-2.

CHAPTER IV.

THE EMPIRE. THE CITIES OF NORTH ITALY AND TUSCANY.

Sources.—Documents in F. Kalténbrunner, *Actenstücke zur Geschichte des Deutschen Reiches* (1273–1308), E. Winklemann, *Acta Imperii inedita seculi XIII. et XIV.*, vol. ii.; F. Kern, *Acta Imperii, Angliæ et Franciæ* (1267–1313). J. F. Böhmer, *Regesta Regum et imp. Rom.* (911–1313), Frankfort, 1831. The new edition of this register from the death of Rudolf to the accession of Louis of Bavaria (1314) has not yet appeared.

Modern Works.—A study much quoted in connection with the political affairs of Florence at this period is that of G. Levi, “Bonifazio VIII. e le sue relazioni col Commune di Firenze,” Rome, 1882. It was originally published in vol. v of the *Archivio della Soc. Rom. di Stor. Pat.* The writer wishes to prove that Boniface plotted to seize the whole of Tuscany. More than half way through his paper he notes that his, perchance, too numerous observations have up to that point only led to conjecture (p. 74). By the multitude of his suppositions, Sig. Levi creates a murky atmosphere in which Boniface can only appear besmirched. All the time, too, he has in mind to try to vindicate the authenticity of Dino Compagni, then much impugned. Hence he himself, p. 46, observes that his work is somewhat wearisome by reason of the multitude of its aims. One can only agree with him.

FROM the chronicles and documents of the time it is clear that the relations between Boniface and the Church of Germany or the Kings of the Romans were not of very great importance. A scrutiny of the seventy or eighty documents in Kaltenbrunner shows the Pope in conflict with Duke Meinhard of Carinthia for oppression of the church of Trent,¹ and with the son of King Rudolf, the

Adolf
appeals for
the help of
Boniface,
1295.

¹ N. 464, Sept. 5, 1295. Cf. nn. 474, 503. His story has been told already. *Supra*, Vol. XVII, p. 165 f.

cruel and unscrupulous¹ Albert the one-eyed duke of Austria, for similar oppression of the church of Salzburg.² Other documents show him appointing bishops, collectors of tithes, granting dispensations, etc., none of which things need detain us. We may turn, instead, to his relations first with King Adolf and then with his successor, King Albert.

The first, whose character is highly extolled by many of his contemporaries,³ who "stood for the clergy",⁴ being called "the Priests' King", and who, if at times cruel, is acknowledged by all to have been chivalrous and brave, was ever hampered by poverty, and by the unceasing opposition of Albert of Austria. The latter had counted on succeeding his father, and never forgave Adolf for having been preferred before him.

When Boniface became Pope, Adolf was committed to war against France. He had accepted (1294) a hundred thousand marks of silver from Edward I. of England to help him against Philip.⁵ Some little time before this,

¹ So is he described by Stubbs, *Germany in the Later Middle Ages*, p. 80.

² July 6, 1297, n. 476. A. had been excommunicated by Conrad, archbp. of S. in 1296. As in June, 1297, there was question of his being nominated King in place of Adolf, Albert lost no time in being reconciled with the Archbishop (Sept. 24, 1297). Conrad acted "auctoritate fretus apostolica". Cf. *Ann. Austr. contin. Zwettlen.*, ap. *M. G. SS.*, ix, p. 658.

³ We are told he was elected "propter miram probitatem et militiæ florem." *Mart. Pol. cont. Brabant.*, ap. *M. G. SS.*, xxiv, p. 264. Cf. *Gesta Boemundi arch. Trev.*, c. 23, ap. *ib.*, p. 475. Against him, on the contrary, are the *Annals of Colmar*, ap. Böhmer, *Fontes*, ii, or *M. G. SS.*, xvii, and the rhyming chronicler, Ottokar v. Steier († 1315), *Oesterreichische Reimchronik* (1250-1309), ap. *Mon. Germ. hist., Deutsche Chroniken*, Bd. v, Thl. 1, 2. Cf. the late chronicler Ebendorfer of Haselbach († 1464), *Chron. regum Rom.*, ap. Pez, *SS. rer. Austr.*, ii, 689, and the other German chroniclers already quoted.

⁴ *Herm. Alt. cont.*, ap. Böhmer, *Fontes*, iii, p. 55. "Stetit pro clero."

⁵ Godfrey of Ensmingen, *Chron.*, p. 135, ap. Böhmer, ii, p. 135. The *Annals of Colmar*, *ib.*, p. 34, say 30,000 marks.

the inhabitants of Valenciennes had risen against John I., count of Hainault. They offered to do homage to the King of France on condition that their city was placed under the authority of Guy Dampierre, count of Flanders. That foolish prince who was ever playing into the hands of the wily French King, his greatest enemy, agreed to the condition, and thereby incurred the enmity of Adolf.¹ Unable by force of arms to get the better of Guy, the King of the Romans turned to Pope Boniface, asking him for help even before he had sent envoys formally to congratulate him on his succession. He wanted him to strengthen by his authority ecclesiastical proceedings already instituted against Guy. After the usual introductory "devoutly kissing the Pope's feet", Adolf "by God's grace, King of the Romans, ever Augustus" began: "The two powers, the spiritual and the temporal, have been instituted by Divine Providence in this world for the ruling of men, in order that those who cannot be coerced by the severity of the temporal sword, may be subdued by the power of the spiritual sword. We, therefore, most earnestly beg Your Holiness that you would deign to excommunicate Guy, count of Flanders and his adherents, already proscribed at the instance of the illustrious John, count of Hainault, and to order the prelates in their dominions to announce publicly in suitable places that they are excommunicated, and, seeing that they have lain under the ban for a year and more, that they must be more strictly avoided by everyone."²

A few weeks later, in reply to the letter in which Boniface had announced to him his election, and his

Adolf's
formal
embassy,
1295.

¹ Kervyn de Lettenhove, *Hist. de Flandre*, ii, p. 366.

² Winklemann, *Acta imp.*, n. 230, March 30, 1295. Cf. *ib.*, n. 164, p. 123. On the "equally miserable and long" life of Guy D., see Marius d'Assigny, *The Hist. of the Earls of Flanders*, London, 1730.

readiness to serve him, seeing that, when in an inferior position, he had sincerely loved him, Adolf dispatched a solemn embassy to Rome. His envoys were Henry, bishop of Brixen, "a prince of the Empire," Master Landulf, Provost of Worms, "a physician and guardian of our health," and our kinsman the illustrious Gerlach of Isenburg. They were the bearers of a letter in which Adolf thanked God for having deigned, after the resignation of Peter of Morrone, quickly to give to the Church so doughty and worthy a spouse, one so full of wisdom, and one who, by his paternal advice, will be a help to him in ruling the Empire. They had both been raised by God for mutual help,¹ and so he commended to the Pope, himself, his children, and his kingdom in order that he might, "according to God," ordain what was best "for the honour of God, the liberty of the Church, the true faith, the Holy Land (for the liberation of which we are keenly anxious) and the good estate of the Empire." His envoys who know all the secrets of his heart, will make known to him the affection of his most devoted son.²

For some reason the King's envoys were a long time on the road, and on May 23, Boniface, writing from Velletri,³ blamed Adolf, of whom he has heard much good, for not sending the usual embassy, and especially for taking money, like a mercenary, to break that peace of Christendom which he was elected to preserve. Especially at this time, he ought not to undertake any hostile steps against "our most dear son, Philip, King of France". At the same time he wrote to the archbishops

¹ Adolf describes himself as constituted "super presidentes temporaliter super terram". Ep. of April 25, 1295, ap. Kern, *Acta*, n. 100.

² *Ib.* Adolf's affectionate reverence for the Pope is greater "plus quam aliquis devotus filius".

³ The date and place are given wrongly in Raynaldus, *Ann.*, 1295, n. 45. Cf. *Reg.*, nn. 863 ff.

Adolf
blamed and
urged to
remain at
peace,
1295-6.

of Germany and others urging them to exhort Adolf to peace, not to help him should he go to war,¹ but to assist in every way the legates, whom he was sending to Adolf empowered to suspend for the time all obligations which he might have contracted.²

The King's envoys reached the Pope at last, and on June 27, 1295, Boniface wrote to their master to say that he had received them kindly and would lend a gracious ear to their petitions. At the same time he asked Adolf to give a favourable reception to the envoys whom he was sending to him, and to make good his promises.³

Month after month, year after year, Boniface continued to use every means in his power to keep the peace between the Kings of France and England and the allies which each of them was seeking. He reminded Adolf that "the emperors and kings of the Romans . . . are called to their high position to be the advocates and chief defenders of the Church, to crush the enemies of the faith, and to subdue the nations of the barbarians to it, in order to our lasting peace and that of all the faithful. But these blessings cannot be obtained if Christian princes and peoples quarrel among themselves".⁴

How far the Pope's letters and envoys affected Adolf, Adolf fails
the English. it is hard to say; but, to a certain extent, at any rate, he acted as though he had been influenced by them. It is certain that he collected troops and that, by asserting that Philip's predecessors and Philip himself had contravened the rights of the Empire, he seemed to be seeking a cause of quarrel with him.⁵

¹ Raynaldus, *l.c.*, n. 46.

² *Ib.* and *Reg.*, n. 867.

³ *Reg.*, n. 871, June 27, 1295. "Et quod compleat opere quod exprimit ore."

⁴ Ep. to Adolf of Aug. 18, 1296: "Noctes insompnes," ap. Raynaldus, *Ann.*, 1296, n. 21.

⁵ Ep. of Boniface, Aug. 13, ap. Raynaldus, *ib.*, n. 18. Cf. *Annals of Colmar*, an. 1295, *l.c.*, p. 32.

He tries to
strengthen
his position.

But he did nothing with his forces to help Edward. He merely promised to assist the Burgundians against France. He did, however, use his forces and our King's money to advance his own interests, and to establish his power, so that our historians and others roundly accuse him of violating his agreement.¹ In the course of establishing his authority, he bought the marquisate of Meissen, and sent vicars into Italy. In Milan he contented himself with nominating Matteo Visconti as his legate,² but into Tuscany he sent one John of Châlon, seemingly of Châlon-sur-Saône in Burgundy. He was favourably received by Pope Boniface, who, in turn, asked the people to receive him well.³ They, however, "anxious," we are told, "to throw off the yoke of the Empire," offered the Pope some eighty thousand florins, of which the people of Lucca paid eighteen thousand, on condition that he would help them against the new vicar. But, adds the contemporary author we are here quoting,⁴ they wasted their money, because, as Adolf had not up to that time "been confirmed in the Empire" by the Pope, he had no more administrative rights than his subjects thought fit to concede to him.⁵ "Although this brave and gallant gentleman of the house of the counts of Burgundy", as Villani describes him, had been brought

¹ Cf. *Flores Hist.*, iii, p. 104, R. S. See also Matthew of Neuenburg, *Chron.*, p. 47, ed. Hofmeister, 1924. A. got the money "pro auxilio sibi promesso set non prestito . . . infideliter agens". A French source, ap. *Revue historique*, 1889, p. 332, says he had taken money also from Philip, and for it had promised not to move! See also Jean Desnouelles, *Chron.*, ap. *RR. FF. SS.*, xxi, pp. 186-7.

² He styled himself Vicar of the Holy Empire, and placed the imperial eagles on his banner. *Ann. Mediol.*, cc. 67-8, ap. *R. I. SS.*, xvi, pp. 684-5.

³ B. Guidonis, *Vita*.

⁴ Ptolemy of Lucca, *Ann.*, p. 1301.

⁵ *Ib.* "A. confirmatus non erat in Imperio, et ideo eidem administrationis non competebat officium nisi quantum suæ genti placebat."

to Italy by Ghibelline influence, and, with the men-at-arms whom he had brought with him aided by Italian Ghibellines, waged war on Florence and Siena, he in a short time lost their confidence. "He was," explains Villani, "of the French tongue." Accordingly, the Florentines and the Guelfs of Tuscany turned to Boniface, who contrived to bring about his return to Burgundy. He made the Vicar's brother bishop of Liège, and arranged that the Guelf cities of Tuscany should give money to the Vicar himself (1295).¹

Despite this check, the power of Adolf in Germany was steadily increasing.² This was enough to turn against him many of the Princes who wished for personal independence. Of this feeling the crafty Albert of Austria availed himself. He got money from Philip of France,³ and with it had no difficulty in forming a strong party against his sovereign. Taking advantage of the coronation of Wenceslaus of Bohemia (June 2, Whit-Sunday), Gerard, archbishop of Mainz, Albert himself, the electors of Saxony and Brandenburg, and Wenceslaus conspired against Adolf. The King, who it is said was preparing to invade France,⁴ turned his attention to the conspirators instead. Albert managed, however, to get his kinsman, Albert, count of Haigerlock, to Rome with sixteen thousand marks, and with letters from his party asking the Pope to approve of their election of the duke of Austria. The envoy, according to his own story, got some letters from the Pope and cardinals; but, say

Conspiracy
against
Adolf.

¹ Villani, viii, 24, Ptolemy, presumably sarcastically, adds: "Pecuniam sibi retinuit (Boniface) pro terris Imperii eidem collatam; in hoc volens ostendere dominium Papæ dominio Imperatoris præferri."

² *Gesta Boemundi*, c. 23, ap. *M. G. SS.*, xxiv, p. 475.

³ Villani, iv, 54. According to *Mat. of N.*, ap. Böhmer, *F.*, iv, p. 169, Albert said: "Si dominus meus Romanorum princeps stipendiarius est Angli effectus, et ego minori dedecore stipendiarius ero Franci."

⁴ Eberhard Alta., *Ann.*, p. 543, ap. Böhmer, *Fontes*, ii, p. 543.

the Annals of Colmar, which we are quoting, the simple man had no notion of their contents.¹ Evidently his money enabled the ignorant count to buy some kind of documents from some officials of the chancery, but they were not the documents he was sent for. Still, they served their purpose. Meetings were held of Albert's supporters (May 1 and June 22, 1298), and it was given out that they had obtained papal sanction for their action. Then, accusing Adolf of having devastated churches, violated virgins, taken pay from the King of England—a thing most unworthy of the King of the Romans—and of having rather lowered than improved the general condition of the Empire,² they declared him deposed. They then proclaimed Albert King in his stead, and unfurled the standard of rebellion. Adolf, meanwhile, had sent envoys to Rome to inquire about the papal approval alleged to have been issued for his deposition. Boniface at once declared that he had absolutely refused to grant any such approval, and that any letters setting forth that he had given any such sanction had been issued without his knowledge. "Tell your master," he said in conclusion, "that he may be sure I am speaking the truth, for I will consecrate him emperor whenever he comes to me."³

But, unfortunately for himself, Adolf was too eager to encounter his rival. He met him at Gellenheim near Worms, and was slain in the battle which ensued (July 2, 1298), possibly by Albert himself.

Adolf is slain, 1298, but Boniface will not acknowledge Albert, 1299.

¹ "Tenorem literarum omnis homo simpliciter ignoravit." Ap. Böhmer, *F.*, ii, p. 85. Even Albert's chief supporters dared not say in public that they had obtained genuine papal letters of approval. They simply said: "Id (papal permission to transfer their allegiance from Adolf to another) obtinuerunt ut a pluribus dicebatur." *Ib.*, p. 89.

² "Rem publicam non auxisset sed magis dissipasset" Siffrid. *Compend. Hist.*, ap. *M. G. SS.*, xxv, p. 713. Cf. *Chron. Colmar*, ap. Böhmer, *l.c.*, p. 84.

³ *A. of C.*, p. 85.

Adolf being thus out of the way, Albert of Hapsburg was unanimously re-elected (July 27, 1298) and crowned King of the Romans (Aug. 24). Conscious of the unworthy way in which he had achieved his proud position, and knowing well that it could not reach its crowning glory without the goodwill of Boniface, Albert essayed to win his acceptance of the choice of the electors. This, despite the great efforts of his envoys, he completely failed to obtain (1299).¹

In connection with Boniface's refusal to confirm the election of Albert, an extravagant story has reached us. As we might have expected, it comes from Franciscus Pipinus,² and is repeated, as usual in connection with stories against Boniface, by Ferreti.³ Some modern historians, loath to omit a picturesque story, have inserted it in their narrative, but, having some regard for their reputation for impartiality, have qualified it by an : "it is said." ⁴ Others have given it as a reliable record.⁵ Two reasons seem sufficient to show that it is not such a record. When the incidents of the story took place is not known. While Pipinus and Ferreti attach them to Albert's embassy of 1299, others attach them to the second.⁶ The other reason is the very extravagance of

Silly story in connection with his refusal.

¹ B. Guid., p. 671, and Amabricus, p. 457, in *Vit. B.* ; Ptolemy of L., *Annal.*, p. 1303, and *H.E.*, xxiv, 37 ; *Ann. Rotomag.*, ap. M. G. SS., xxvi, p. 504.

² *Chron.*, c. 41 and c. 47.

³ *Hist.*, vol. i, p. 132 ff., ed. Cipolla. Cf. *supra*, p. 15.

⁴ So Gregorovius, *Rome*, v, p. 568.

⁵ Among such it is a pity to see Stubbs, *Germany in the later Mid. Ages*, p. 87. But he is all wrong in this connection. He says "He (B.) went further than refusing confirmation. He excommunicated the King elect". The last statement is certainly wrong. There exists a letter of B. (it will be cited presently in the text), dated Apr. 13, 1301, in which he says that circumstances had up till then prevented him from pursuing the matter. Ap. Raynaldus, *Ann.*, 1301, n. 2.

⁶ Doc. in Finke, *Mon. Arag.*, i, p. 133.

the story itself, and what is said of its source. We will give it as it was given to James II. in a letter to him (c. April, 1303) from Arnau Sabastida, "Maestre Racional (Chancellor of the Exchequer) of his court." Arnau tells "the great and powerful lord 'En Jacme' by God's grace King 'Darago'" that he is sending him the contents of a letter which his nephew had received at Montpellier. His nephew had informed him that a certain Geral Pelegri had received letters from Rome in which it was said ¹ that Boniface had on Holy Thursday (Apr. 4, 1303) preached before the cardinals, bishops, and a number of other clergy. He had thrice asked the assembly whom they considered him to be, when a cardinal replied that he held the place of God on earth,² and to this all assented. Thereupon he declared that all the dignitaries present were deposed, and so all their hats and rings were presented to him. However, when the sermon was finished they were returned to them inasmuch as they were obedient to Holy Church.

He then retired, and presently reappeared before them clad in imperial purple or scarlet, with the red buskins, and gilt shoes and spurs. Brandishing a sword, he asked if all believed he was Emperor. Answered in the affirmative, he explained that he was thus clad as he was above all Christendom, that he wore the cross as Pope, and that he carried a sword because Our Lord had given one to St. Peter to show that he was to have both spiritual and temporal power. All were then bidden to adjourn to St. Peter's. This time, he appeared before them clad in black, and weeping copiously thus addressed them: "Barons and all of you marvel not to see me in black,

¹ The reader will perceive that we have nothing but very "second-hand" gossip.

² "Leva . . . I. cardenal que li dix, que el tenia loc de Deu en terra, et que tenia loch de sent P." etc. *L.c.*, p. 134.

because he whom the Church has exalted is angry with your disobedience to the Church." In sorrow he then declared that he would remain before St. Peter and the relics till the disobedient became submissive to him and the Church. All, thereupon, exclaimed that they were ready with all their heart and strength to do what he wished, and proceeded to offer lighted candles before the statue of St. Peter.

This is the sort of buffoonery to which, modified somewhat in their narrations, first Pipinus and then Ferreti would have us believe that the great souled Boniface treated the envoys of Albert of Hapsburg in 1299.¹

When Boniface first heard of the death of Adolf, he is said to have been quite stupified at the idea of the author of the death of a King of the Romans having the effrontery to step into his place with the unjust support of the electors.² At length, however, continues the historian, as he was a man of spirit, he at length broke out: "May God punish me, if I avenge not the slain King! All kingdoms are in my hands which hold the two swords. Hence if one will not now suffice me, I will use the other till the slayer of the King is punished."³ Whatever of fact there may be in these words of a partisan of Adolf, and whatever words Boniface may have used when he heard of the death of Adolf, we have seen that he firmly refused to confirm the election of Albert. Moreover, he had no intention of taking up a mere negative position with regard to the intruder. Whether he made this clear or not to Albert's envoys, that Prince knew well

Boniface
summons
Albert to
justify
himself.

¹ The story is perchance the outcome of some Ghibelline wag to throw into a melodramatic form the attitude of Boniface to the Colonna cardinals and the French King.

² The monk of Fürstenfeld (commonly known as Volcmar), *De Gestis Principum* (1273-1326), ap. Böhmer, *Fontes*, i, p. 23.

³ *Ib.*

that such would be the case. He accordingly drew still nearer to Philip of France. The two sovereigns met at Quatre-Vaux between Toul and Vaucouleurs (Dec., 1299),¹ and before they parted it was arranged that Blanche, the sister of the French King, should forthwith marry Rudolf, duke of Austria, Albert's son,² and, if Gallic authorities are to be credited,³ that the King of the Romans should give Philip all the territory between the Meuse and the Rhine. Leroux believes that this cession of territory was really made by Albert secretly as the price of Philip's support against the Pope.⁴

However this may be, Boniface was not slow in taking steps to counteract the effects of the alliance of the two Kings. The important see of Treves had become vacant by the death of archbishop Boëmund (Dec. 9, 1299). Boniface, thereupon, disregarding the rights of the canons, promptly nominated the Dominican Dietrich of Nassau, brother of the late King Adolf, "in order to resist the folly (vesania)" of Albert.⁵ A better man for his purpose he could not have chosen, for the new archbishop proceeded to raise money on the property of the diocese in the most reckless fashion, and offered a vigorous opposition to Albert.⁶

In order to mollify the Pope, Albert now sent to him fresh envoys, among whom was the famous Nogaret

¹ *Ann. Halesbrun.*, ap. *M. G. SS.*, xxiv, p. 46; Böhmer, *Regesta Imp.*, p. 266; Leroux, *Relations*, p. 103, gives other authorities for this interview.

² *Ann. Austr., cont. Zwet.*, ap. *M. G. SS.*, ix, p. 659.

³ Will. of Nangis, *Chron.*, i, 308; *Grand Chroniques*, cc. 30 and 34.

⁴ *L.c.*, p. 107. Blanche and Rudolf were actually married in Paris in Feb., 1300.

⁵ *Gesta Baldewini Trever.*, lib. i, c. 1, ap. Baluze, *Miscell.*, i, p. 311, ed. Mansi. The nomination was made on Jan. 18, 1300. Cf. Kaltenbrunner, *Actenstücke*, n. 481. He also reserved to himself the right to appoint to the sees of Cologne and Mainz. Cf. *ib.*, nn. 649 and 682.

⁶ *Gesta B.*, *l.c.*

(1300). The negotiations came to an end when Boniface, so it appears, proposed to recognize Albert on condition that he should give up Tuscany to the Church.¹ In a letter on the subject of this cession, Boniface declared that the Church, whose power he extols, transferred the Roman Empire to the Germans, gave certain Princes the right of electing the King of the Romans, and was the source of all the pre-eminence that the Empire possesses. Instituted to be the Protectors of the Church, the Emperors have at times been its oppressors. However, for the general peace, he asks that Tuscany, whose constant intestine disturbances are always causing trouble to the adjoining states of the Church, should be restored to the Church, to which it once belonged. The Church could of itself take back what had once been its own, still he preferred to try to persuade Albert to return it of his own good will.²

If Boniface was in earnest in desiring that the cession of Tuscany to the Church should be the condition of his recognition of Albert, he was not very tactful in formulating his ideas.

At any rate these negotiations fell through, like the preceding ones, and Albert, relying perhaps on the French alliance, showed no disposition to reopen them.

Accordingly, not concerning himself as to how close the alliance between Philip and Albert may have been, Boniface at length commenced definite proceedings against Albert. On April 13, 1301, he wrote to the three ecclesiastical electors of Mainz, Cologne, and Trier. He

¹ Dupuy, *Hist. du diff.*, p. 253, and Theiner, *Cod. Dip.*, i, n. 547. Ep. of May 13, 1300, to the duke of Saxony, asking him to give his consent to the cession, if Albert agrees to it.

² The letter of May 13, cited in the previous note. Among other strong phrases used in this letter, we may add the one where, speaking of the Church, he subjoins: "A qua quicquid habet Imperator sumpsit exordium."

pointed out to them that it was the prerogative of the Roman Pontiff, "to whom all power in heaven and on earth has been given," to destroy all evil, especially such as is public and such as well-nigh the whole world flocking to Rome has reported to the Holy See. Of this nature is the treatment by Albert of his liege lord Adolf, King of the Romans, from whom he had received many great fiefs.

Up to this many weighty circumstances have prevented proceedings being taken against him. But lest too great procrastination in this matter should cause it to be supposed that his conduct has received approval, we must take action without further delay. For to us does authority belong to examine into the fitness of him who is elected King of the Romans.¹ The archbishops are therefore ordered to bid Albert within six months send fully instructed envoys to explain or justify his conduct. Otherwise his subjects will be absolved from all allegiance to him.

At the same time, in order to facilitate the carrying out of his instructions, Boniface sent Angelus, bishop of Nepi, as his legate into Germany.²

Albert is
victorious,
1301-2.

Although Boniface had acted boldly, he was, according to the gossip of the Curia, getting afraid as the year wore on that Albert would appear in arms in Italy, and try to win the imperial crown by force. He was the more afraid seeing that there was talk of Albert's being still more closely connected with the French King by the marriage in due course of one of his daughters with one

¹ Ep. ap. Raynaldus, *Ann.*, 1301, n. 2. To us "jus et auctoritas examinandi personam in regem Romanorum electam pro tempore, ejusque innunctio, consecratio, coronatio, manus impositio, necnon denuntiatio, seu reputatio idoneitatis personae vel formae et nominatio regia, seu, ratione indignitatis personae vel formae, reprobatio pertinere noscuntur."

² *Ib.*, n. 3. Cf. *Reg.*, 4328, 4334.

of Philip's sons.¹ A little later, however, about September 29, 1301, the ecclesiastical electors in Germany took action against Albert along with Rudolf, duke of Bavaria, count Palatine of the Rhine, and other nobles. But he was too strong for them. He scourged them thoroughly "in multis flagellavit", says a chronicler,² and brought them to their knees.

Albert was certainly victorious for the moment. He had nevertheless been taught his lesson, and realized that he must win recognition from the Pope or he would have no peace. Accordingly fresh envoys, the bishop of Toul and the Chancellor, were sent to plead his cause before Boniface in the early part of the year 1302. But, though the victory of their sovereign enabled them to take a firmer tone than before,³ they were for a long time unable to effect their purpose. They returned to Germany about the feast of St. John the Baptist (June 24) with "close" letters, which were not read at once, "as the King and his councillors were afraid to open them."⁴

Although their fears were realized, fresh envoys were sent to the Pope—two knights and a "clerical knight, very learned in the law".⁵ This mission was successful. Recognition for Albert was granted (Apr. 30), perhaps through the skill of the man of law, perhaps to gain an ally against Philip⁶—"out of hatred of the French King"⁷

¹ See that retailer of gossip, Gerau of Albalato, ap. *Aus den Tagen*, p. xxxii. Cf. Leroux, p. 110.

² *Ann. Neresteim.*, ap. *M. G. SS.*, x, p. 25. Cf. *Ann. Halesbrun.*, ap. *ib.*, xxiv, p. 46; Siffrid, ap. *ib.*, xxv, 715; Henry of Rebdorf, ap. Böhmer, *Fontes*, iv, p. 510, etc.

³ At least so said the gossip of the Curia. Cf. the *Diary of L. Martini*, ap. *Aus d. T.*, p. iv.

⁴ *Chron. Colmar.*, ap. Böhmer, *Font.*, ii, p. 95. ⁵ *Ib.*, p. 96.

⁶ *Mart. Pol. cont. Anglic.*, ap. *M. G. SS.*, xxiv, p. 255.

⁷ So say such French Chronicles as those of Rouen: "in odium regis Franciæ." *Annal. Rotomag.*, ap. *M. G. SS.*, xxvi, p. 504. Cf. Ptol. of Lucca, *Ann.*, p. 1306.

Albert is
reconciled to
Boniface,
1303.

with whom the Pope's quarrel was now at its height,¹ or perhaps from diplomatic common sense. Albert had now been *de facto* King of the Romans for some four and a half years; he had triumphed in the field over such opposition as Boniface had been able to raise against him; he was offering good terms,² and peace with him would reduce the too great number of his enemies.³

The
consistory of
Ap. 30,
1303.

Animated no doubt more or less by all these motives, Boniface held a consistory on April 30, at which the three envoys, joined now by the Chancellor, were present.⁴ Boniface opened the proceedings by commenting on the two luminaries made by God to enlighten the world, i.e. the sun and moon, or, according to the common interpretation, the ecclesiastical and the civil power. On the present occasion, said Boniface, he wished to regard the Emperor as the sun from whom all other earthly rulers derived their power, as all spiritual rulers do from Christ and his vicar the successor of St. Peter. Now it is well known that the said Vicar of Christ transferred the imperial power from the Greeks to the Germans, i.e. to the seven electors. Let not therefore Gallic pride pretend that it knows no superior.⁵ It is under the Emperor⁶ and the Pope. It is true that the present

¹ Philip had been excommunicated, Apr. 13, 1303. Cf. Potthast, n. 25230.

² See his privileges, ap. Theiner, *Cod. dip.*, i, nn. 569, 570.

³ Johan. Victor., *Hist.*, iii, c. 10, p. 333, ed. Schneider. "Papa contrarios habens sibi reges et ordines."

⁴ The minutes of this meeting are given by Henry of Hervordia, *Chron.*, p. 217, ed. Potthast, but better in the *Register* of John di Pontissara, ii, p. 550 ff.

⁵ Cf. the words of Plasian in the Paris parliament of June, 1303, ap. Dupuy, *Hist. du d.*, p. 105. Cf. pp. 383, 582.

⁶ The position of the Emperor is put more strongly in Hervordia's summary of this consistory. "Omnes talia (that the K. of F. has no superior) dicentes mentiuntur per gulam suam. Ipse enim imperator solus est monarcha mundi, et non est aliquis cui non preest, et omnia regna mundi tenentur ab eo, sicut et omnino de necessitate salutis, est

King of the Romans was at one time in opposition to us and the Roman Church, but, as he now wishes to conform to our will, 'the time of mercy has come. The Church could again have transferred the Empire, but it preferred to act rather with kindness than vigour. Now, therefore, supplying the defects of Albert's election, we declare him lawful King. This we do because we hope good things from him in the future, for in the words of Tobias (vii, 7), "He is the son of a good and most virtuous man"—the "Catholic, faithful, and devout" Rudolf whose love of truth passed into a proverb.¹ And even if he were not to do right, we are not so helpless that we cannot repress him or any other prince of this world. Indeed, if all the Princes of the world were arrayed against us and the Church, as long as we stood with the truth, we should think no more of them than a straw; but, if truth and justice were not on our side, we should be overwhelmed with fear. Then, quoting from the first epistle of St. Peter (chap. ii), he bade all obey the new King who should understand that if he would recover the rights of the Empire, we declare that we will defend his rights more than our own, and that against the King of France or any other.

After Boniface had finished, he bade the King's envoys speak for their master. Thereupon the Chancellor proclaimed that the Pope "was the lord of all . . . holding true power". He praised his discretion, his learning, his justice, his magnificence, his severity, and

omni humane creature subesse Romano pontifici, ut in *Extravagante* 'Unam Sanctam'." Cap. 27, p. 217. For the famous bull *Unam S.*, see Raynaldus, *Ann.*, 1302, n. 13. We have here the complete political theory of the M. Ages.

¹ Hence, in all Germany, if a man broke a promise it used to be said: "Non habet veritatem dictum ejus sicut d. Radulphi comitis." *Reg. of J. P.*, p. 552.

his mercy, showing how in the recent negotiations he had displayed both vigour and mercy, so that his name would be great from generation to generation.¹

He then proceeded to praise "the King of Germany". He was a devout Catholic, devoted to the Church, and ready to do the Pope's behests. He too was just, and also fortunate in war, and trusted that God would give him the Empire for the defence of the Church and the peace of the world. Thanking the Pope for correcting the King, and reconciling him to himself, the Chancellor declared that he was ready to subscribe to all that was necessary to complete the negotiations.

Boniface then concluded that if Albert stood by his undertakings, they would between them confound "the pride of the Gauls". The proceedings closed with the "Te Deum", after the ambassadors had sworn for their master that he would fulfil his engagements.

On the same day as the consistory just spoken of was held, Boniface published the bull "Patris eterni filius", in which, embodying what was said in that assembly, he formally acknowledged Albert as King of the Romans and Emperor elect.²

At the same time the various electors were exhorted to honour and obey Albert³; and, on the following day, the benefices of which he had been deprived were restored

¹ The Chancellor had realized that when dealing with the great it is necessary to lay on praise "with a trowel". "Et commendavit Papam de summa discrezione seu circumspectione, litteratura, justicia, magnificencia, mirabilitate, miraculositate, terribilitate, severitate, et misericordia, etc." . . . "Dixit de potestate . . . qualiter erat illimitata et super omnes, etc."

² Ap. Raynaldus, *Ann.*, 1303, n. 2, or Theiner, *l.c.*, n. 567.

³ Potthast, nn. 25235-8. Any leagues made by Albert were also declared dissolved, n. 25236. Cf. the chroniclers, *Chron. Colmar.*, ap. Böhmer, *F.*, i, 96; *Chron. Osterhov.*, ap. *ib.*, iv, p. 560; *Mat. of Neuen.*, *ib.*, p. 170, etc.

to John, the King's chancellor.¹ Finally, on the last day of May, Boniface duly notified all those whom it concerned, the clergy and laity of the Principate of Orange, of the kingdom of Arles, and of other provinces that had once been under the jurisdiction of the Empire, that, when Albert had received the imperial diadem, they were to return to his allegiance.²

On his side the now acknowledged King of the Romans sent to Boniface formal documents furnished with great round seals of white wax bearing the image of Albert seated on a throne after the manner of the King of the Romans, and holding a lily in his right hand, and in his left an orb surmounted by a cross. The seals bore the legend: "Albertus Dei gratia Romanorum Rex semper Augustus," and were suspended by red and yellow silk ribbons. These documents were dated July 17, 1303. In the first, Albert thanked the Pope for all that he had done for him, acknowledged that in times past the Popes had had much to suffer from his predecessors, but, to lessen the danger of Boniface's having to suffer through him, he undertook not to send into Tuscany or Lombardy any Vicar that was unacceptable to the Holy See. He also placed his armed services at the disposal of the Pope against his enemies, and undertook not to try to have any of his children elected King of the Romans without the Pope's consent.³ Albert's
privileges.

In the second document of the same date, Albert acknowledged that the right of the electors to choose the

¹ *Ib.*, n. 25239. Cf. 25049.

² See the document in the *Register of John de P.*, ii, p. 584. What is said about the kingdom of Arles or Burgundy is, of course, directed against Philip of France, who had bought Burgundy from Count Otho (March 2, 1295). Cf. P. Fournier, *Le Royaume d'Arles*, p. 299; and E. Boutaric, *Notice et extraits*, vol. xx, p. 147 ff.

³ Ep. ap. Theiner, *Cod. D.*, i, n. 569. Albert's wife was the sister of Conradin. Hence the clause about the election.

King of the Romans came from the Holy See, from which the Emperors received the power of the temporal sword. They were to be the "advocates" of the Roman Church and the defenders of the Catholic faith. He swore to be loyal (*fidelis*) and obedient to Boniface and his successors, and not only to avoid harming them at all, but to help them in every way. He also confirmed all the privileges granted by his father and his other predecessors to the Roman Church, and undertook to preserve the liberties of the Church in general. Then, while saying that he expected the help of the Holy See when he came into Italy, he promised to strive to recover the rights of the Empire, and, when he became Emperor and had the right to use the golden bulla, to confirm under it all these engagements.¹

Boniface did not live to test the sincerity of Albert's promises ; but we are assured that when he was about to grant him tithes from all the clergy, his design was cut short by death. And so, to use, while condemning, the preposterous words of the monk of Erfurt, "the crime of giving spiritual things to laymen was stopped by God."²

At any rate, by accepting Albert, Boniface gave to Germany a Prince who was, to say the least, among the most enlightened of his contemporaries, and whose records show plainly the pains which he took to govern well.³

¹ Theiner, *l.c.*, n. 570. Cf. John of Vitoduranus, *Chron.*, pp. 487-8, with note 1, ed. Baethgen.

² *Chron.*, p. 695. In the unbridled language of many chroniclers of the time, he says that Boniface died like "a mad dog" gnawing his own flesh !

³ He was not the sort of man that the legend—otherwise charming—of William Tell would lead one to expect. Cf. L. Boiteux in the article "Albert I. d'Autriche" in the *Dict. d'hist. et de géog.* of Baudrillart, Paris, 1912 ff.

THE AFFAIRS OF NORTH ITALY AND TUSCANY.

Dante, essentially a man of his age, is constantly bewailing the wretched state of north Italy, whose cities, ever at war with each other, were at the same time torn asunder by internal factions.

Boniface would make peace between Genoa and Venice.

“ Ah ! slavish Italy ! thou inn of grief !
 Vessel without a pilot in loud storm !
 While now thy living ones
 In thee abide not without war ; and one
 Malicious gnaws another ; ay, of those
 Whom the same wall and the same moat contains.” ¹

And if the fierce partisan has no word of praise for the efforts of Boniface and his predecessors to bring the blessings of peace to the bleeding cities of the north, he at least forgets not to bring under his lash the Kings of the Romans who left them to their fate :—

“ O German Albert ! who abandon’st her
 That is grown savage and unmanageable
 When thou should’st clasp her flanks with forked heels.
 Just judgment from the stars fall on thy blood
 For that thy sire and thou have suffered thus,
 Through greediness of yonder realms detained,
 The garden of the Empire to run to waste.” ²

If Dante could only see good to “ those sunk in grief ” if done by *Cæsar*, and has but the hardest of words for Boniface, let us strive to be more just, and see that he, at least, beheld “ the oppression of the nobles ” and strove to bring it about that parts of the land at any rate might “ sweet peace enjoy ”.

After a score of years of imperfect peace, their commercial rivalries caused war to break out again between Venice and Genoa (1291). The latter city in favour with the Palæologi who were established at Galata,

¹ Purg., c. vi.

² *Ib.*

had founded a new colony at Caffa in the Crimea, and were aiming at capturing all the Black Sea trade. Allying itself with Pisa, now, however, no longer the formidable rival of Genoa,¹ Venice endeavoured to check this move. At first it was unsuccessful, and had been badly defeated (Oct., 1294) when Boniface stepped in as a peacemaker.

Boniface
orders a
truce.

He reflected, says the famous chronicler of Genoa, James de Varagine, that war between these two famous States meant loss to Christendom, and especially to the Holy Land. He accordingly sent envoys to Genoa and Venice, summoned to Rome our historian, who was archbishop of Genoa, and detained with him "the bishop of the Venetians" who chanced to be in Rome. The papal ambassadors reached their destinations in March (1295), and in the Pope's name bade the cities send plenipotentiaries to him to treat of peace, and meanwhile under pain of excommunication to be incurred *ipso facto*, imposed a truce till the feast of St. John the Baptist (June 24). According to the Genoese writer, the Venetians, discovering what a great fleet his people had ready, simply played to gain time. They had no intention of making peace, but they were not quite ready for war. Negotiations were accordingly broken off, and, after the expiration of the truce,² the Genoese fleet put to sea amid scenes of such enthusiasm that our archbishop took occasion to remark that he wished men were as keen to avenge the wrongs done to Christ, as they are those done to themselves, and that he wished the "glorious armament" was sailing against "the enemies of the Christian faith". The very sight of it would frighten them into submission.³

¹ P. never recovered from the disaster of Meloria (1284).

² Boniface tried in vain to get it prolonged to the feast of St. Michael. Cf. *Reg.*, ep. of May 18, 1295, n. 783.

³ *Chron.*, ap. *R. I. SS.*, ix, pp. 16-17.

From this narrative of the worthy author of the Golden Legend, one is left to infer that the blame for breaking off the negotiations was with the Venetians. But, as we learn from the impartial verdict of Boniface, the blame lay with the Genoese. They ceased to negotiate the moment they thought they had an overwhelming fleet ready (c. July).

Boniface was much distressed at this action of the Genoese. He upbraided them for it, sent a fresh envoy (the Archbishop of Tyre) to them, ordered them to send to him plenipotentiaries within fifteen days after the receipt of his letter, proclaimed a fresh truce, and forbade them to undertake any hostile measure against the Venetians.¹ How precisely these further proceedings of the Pope affected the situation may not be clear; but the great expedition of the Genoese came to nothing. The Guelf Grimaldis and the Ghibelline Dorias flew at each other's throats, the fleet returned to Genoa (Dec.), and the city itself was about the close of the year largely damaged by furious faction fights.²

Although the Genoese took little or no notice of the mission of the archbishop of Tyre, Boniface did not lose hope of making peace. Although he blamed them both in his letters to them, and in those which he wrote to the Venetians, he sent fresh envoys to both States (Dec., 1295).³ But despite the most praiseworthy efforts of the Pope, the war went on. The Genoese had some further successes (1296), but with their disorderly government at home, they were not ultimately able to cope with the well-governed State of Venice.

¹ *Reg.*, nn. 812-13, Aug. 12-13, 1295.

² Villani, *Chron.*, viii, 14. The Guelfs were driven out of the city in Jan., 1296. Cf. G. Stella, *Ann. Gen.*, lib. i, c. 8, p. 1004.

³ *Reg.*, n. 853, Dec. 13, 1295. He sent them "propter animarum salutem, bonum publicum, et statum Christianitatis tranquillitatem et recuperande Terre Sancte . . . succursum".

A fresh
truce
ordered,
1295.

Meanwhile, however, in obedience to the summons of Boniface fresh ambassadors from both cities appeared before the Pope in the early summer of 1296. This time, no doubt because of their intestine troubles, the Genoese ambassadors came with fuller powers for the making of peace.¹ Consequently, to give time to the Venetians to send further instructions, the Pope notified them that he would keep their envoys and those of Genoa with him till the octave of SS. Peter and Paul, and meanwhile "by apostolic authority" declared a truce till the Easter of 1297.²

Peace in
1299.

But the two Republics were utterly selfish, caring neither for the Holy Land nor even for Christendom. Trading advantages were all they cared for, and so in the following year the Sultan Naser Mohammed made a treaty with the Venetians by which, among other clauses favourable to them, "objects prohibited by Christians," i.e., slaves and munitions of war, brought into Egypt by them were to be exempt from duty.³ This and other similar shameful acts against the common weal of Christendom caused Boniface to issue decree after decree against those Christians who supplied the Saracens with arms.⁴

All his efforts, however, were to no purpose. The war continued, now, despite a great defeat at Curzola (1298), perhaps more to the advantage of the Venetians.⁵

¹ So wrote B. to the Venetians: "Inventum est quod hac vice pro parte Januensium mandatum vestro sufficientius fuit oblatum." *Reg.* n. 1593, June 5, 1296.

² *Ib.*; cf. n. 1594 to the Genoese.

³ Cf. S. Romanin, *Storia di Venezia*, ii, 329, quoting from the *Pacta*, i, 23, and Marino Sanudo, iv, 273.

⁴ *Reg.*, nn. 778, May 12, 1295; 1654, Nov. 20, 1296; 2338 f., Apr. 5, 1297; 3109, 3351, 3381.

⁵ For modern English accounts of these events see Hodgson's excellent *Venice in the Thirteenth Cent.*, p. 253 ff.; Carden, *The City*

Peace was at length made on May 25, 1299; but the honour of making it went to Matteo Visconti of Milan, whom we have seen styled "Vicar of the Holy Empire".¹

In the north of the Italian peninsula, Genoa and Venice were far from being the only States at war. There was civil discord or external war everywhere. Parties calling themselves Guelfs or Ghibellines were everywhere causing trouble. In Piedmont, the death of the powerful William VII., marquis of Montferrat (1292), had left the marquisate in the hands of a youth (his son John) of fifteen years of age. At once some of its cities strove for independence, and Matteo Visconti, of Milan, aimed at seizing the whole territory. In Lombardy Azo VIII., marquis of Este-Ferrara, was fighting with his rebellious brothers or with Parma and Modena or Bologna, whilst the last-named city was at times at war with Modena.

Boniface works for peace in Piedmont, Lombardy, etc.

We cannot recount the efforts made by Boniface to bring the blessings of peace to these and other belligerents in North Italy, as we wish to speak at some little length about his more important relations with Florence. We will merely note that he sent his chaplain Raynerius, canon of Volterra, to pacify the marquisate of Montferrat, "torn with the scourge of war"²; and that in 1299 he successfully mediated between Bologna on the one hand, and the marquis of Este and Modena on the other.³

of Genoa, pp. 20 and 233 ff.; J. T. Bent, *Genoa*, chap. viii (not so accurate), etc.

¹ Romanin, *l.c.*, pp. 337-8. The continuation of the Chronicle of Dandolo, ap. *R. I. SS.*, xii, gives an account of this period. On p. 409, when mention is made of the peace of 1299, it is simply said that before that "many Princes and Magnates" had tried in vain to make peace.

² *Reg.*, n. 780, May 7, 1295. Cf. A. Gallenga, *Hist. of Piedmont*, ii, 97 ff.

³ Cf. Matthew de Griffonibus, *Mem. Hist.*, p. 28 (new ed. of *R. I. SS.*); and *Corpus Chron. Bonon.*, i, 258, also new ed. Cf. Muratori, *Ann.*

In view of this and other similar work of Boniface, the old historian of the House of Este took occasion to observe that "in the beginning of his pontificate, Boniface effected a great deal of good in which all Italy shared".¹ In this instance, Boniface benefited himself by his peace-making efforts; for the commune of Bologna passed a resolution to the effect that the Colonnas, enemies of the Pope, were to be regarded as its enemies, for it was always "and is to-day most loyal and devoted to the Supreme Pontiff and the Holy Roman Church".²

Boniface
made the
ruler of Pisa,
1296.

Very gratifying to Boniface also must have been the result of his negotiations with the gallant little republic of Pisa. Under Nicholas IV. it had fallen under the pontifical displeasure, because it had made its Podestà the famous Guido de Montefeltro, then a bitter foe of the Church. Meanwhile, however, Guido himself had submitted to the Pope, and had become a Friar Minor and to Boniface "his beloved son". Thus deprived of their capable leader, the Pisans decided to follow his example and submit to the Pope. They, therefore, sent ambassadors to ask for absolution from excommunication and interdict; to offer five hundred marks of silver in satisfaction for their offences to the Holy See; and to beg Boniface himself to become their Podestà for three years, guaranteeing him an annual pension of four thousand pounds to pay the salaries of the officials.³ To these requests a gracious assent was given by Boniface,

d'Italia, vol. xi, p. 653 f.; V. Vitale, *Il dominio della parte Guelfa in Bologna*, pp. 71-2, and especially A. Gorreta, *La lotta fra il commune Bolognese e la Signoria Estense*, p. 115 ff., Bologna, 1906.

¹ *Historia de Principi di Este*, i, p. 208; cf. pp. 208-9, Ferrara, 1570, a fine folio vol.

² From the archives of Bologna: "Riformagioni e Provvisioni." *Provvis.*, 16, Sept., 1299, ap. V. Vitale, p. 72, n.; Bologna, 1901. Vitale's book treats of the events from 1280-1327.

³ *Reg.*, nn. 1562-5, Feb. 15-20, 1296. Cf. Sardo, *Cron. Pis.*, c. 48.

on account, as he said, of the love he had always had for the State of Pisa even before he became Pope. Then to exercise authority in his name, he nominated the count of Colle Val d'Elsa as his Vicar, exhorting him to prudence in the exercise of his office, and allowing him to have, as assessors, four knights, and as many judges who were to have twelve horses, of which six at least were to be war horses.¹

FLORENCE.

Like so many other cities of Italy at this period, Florence, the queen-city of Tuscany, was torn with factions. Sometimes these factions represented rival families, at others the nobles and the *popolani*, the people, i.e., in trading cities like Florence, the merchants. Very often these parties called themselves by the old party names of Guelfs and Ghibellines; but well-nigh just as often, the Guelfs were no more papal than the Ghibellines were imperialistic. In the days of Boniface VIII., these parties were in the main concerned with their own interests, and thought but little either of those of the Pope or of the Emperor, though they were ready enough to use the influence of either of them to advance their own cause.

We have seen ² how Adolf, King of the Romans, sent into Tuscany the Burgundian John of Châlon. The "White" Guelf, Dino Compagni, says that he was brought to Florence by the nobles (*i potenti cittadini—i grandi*) in the hope of being able through him to overthrow the Government of the people.³ As the nobles

¹ *Ib.*, n. 1566, Feb. 21, 1296, or in full in Raynaldus, *Ann.*, 1296, n. 4.

² *Supra*, p. 118.

³ *Cron.*, i. c. 13

professed to be Ghibellines, it is quite likely that he came by virtue of an understanding between them and Adolf.¹ When, however, he adds that Boniface was also instrumental in bringing him, it would appear that he has mistaken a cordial reception for an invitation, and that the fact is that it was Boniface, not who shared in inviting him, but who, in conjunction with the Guelfs,² brought about his return to Burgundy.

However that may be, neither his coming nor his departure brought internal peace to the Florentines.

Beniface
forbids the
recall of
Giano della
Bella, 1296.

Boniface had no sooner assisted in bringing about the departure of one man whose presence was disturbing Florence, than he felt called upon to help in preventing the recall of another whose return would be equally upsetting. Among the best citizens of Florence was a certain Giano della Bella. Unable to bear the sight of the nobles in the city oppressing those who were unable to resist them, he contrived to bring about the passing of a number of laws, the Ordinances of Justice, which were calculated to curb the insolence of the magnates. Unfortunately, like many another reformer, he failed to realize that grievous ills whether of the human frame or of the body politic cannot be healed all at once; and so, instead of allowing the new laws to effect their purpose steadily, he attempted to force the pace. As we know, both from the "Black" Villani and the "White" Dino, he was, though a worthy citizen, "somewhat presumptuous" and "desired to avenge his wrongs with the arm of the commonwealth".³ His violence caused such disorders in the city that "it stirred the minds of all" against him. Even his own kinsmen advised him to

¹ Cf. Villani, *Cron.*, viii, 10.

² That is, as Villani (*l.c.*) explains, "in conjunction with the Commune of Florence and the Guelfs of Tuscany." Cf. Dino, i, c. 17.

³ Cf. Villani, viii, 1 and 8; Dino, i, 11-13.

leave the city.¹ His similar action at Pistoia brought about like results.²

When, therefore, there was question of bringing such a firebrand back into the city, Boniface, in the interest of peace and good order, sternly forbade his recall. On trustworthy evidence, as he wrote to the Rulers and people of Florence, he had heard that "Gianus called La Bella" had quite upset the quiet of the city, and was bringing about its ruin. For which reason the man had, with good reason, "as it is believed," been expelled from the city. Now, continued Boniface, we have been informed that some, perhaps in ignorance of what Giano had done, were striving to bring about his return to the city. This, under pain of interdict, Boniface expressly forbade.³ Circumstances, as well as the absence of imperial authority, were quite enough to justify this papal interference which had the advantage of effecting its peaceful purpose.

In preventing the return to Florence of the too zealous reformer, Giano della Bella, Boniface was acting in accordance with the wishes of its responsible officials. He had now to oppose them.

Some time before April 24, 1300, proceedings had been commenced by the city authorities against three Florentine officials of the papal court, Simone Gherardi of the Pope's household (*familiarem nostrum*) the Roman agent of the Spini Florentine banking company, Cambio de Sexto, a proctor in Rome, and Noffus Quintavallis.⁴ The charge against them, according to the Pope, simply rested on the evidence of some base informers.⁵ Declaring

Boniface
protects his
officials.

¹ *Dino*, i, 16. ² *Ib.*, i, 25. ³ Ep. of Jan. 23, 1296, *Reg.*, n. 864.

⁴ *Reg.*, n. 3535, Apr. 14, 1300, or ap. Levi, doc. ii.

⁵ "Pretextu cujusdam prave delationis habite contra eos (the authorities of the city)." *Ib.* Levi, p. 40, of the *estratto*, allows that no acts are forthcoming by which one can judge of the justice of the

that the charge, which even involved him, was merely an outcome of party venom,¹ and that he had, to no purpose, already ordered the civic authorities to stop the process, Boniface now peremptorily commanded them to stop it under pain of excommunication, and to send to him within fifteen days Lapo Saltarelli and the others who are said to be the chief of the base informers.

Lapo Saltarelli was a doctor of laws, a kinsman of the Cerchi, a member of the "White" faction, and, even on the authority of the "White" historian Dino, a man of despicable character.² Of the other two nothing seems to be known.

As no notice was taken of the bull of April, Boniface issued a more peremptory one, *Perlato pridem* (May 15, 1300), which has been compared to the *Unam Sanctam*, and which is said by some modern writers to assert "the absolute sovereignty of the Pope over . . . every living creature". This time the bull was addressed to the Inquisitor of the Province of Tuscany as well as to the bishop of Florence. In it the Pope declared that the charge against the members of his Curia lacked truth, and, if it did not, it was levelled against persons over whom the Commune had no jurisdiction, and had been heard in a most irregular manner. He had been informed that some had pretended that he wished to destroy the liberties of their city, and even that he had no right to

accusation against the officials. Nevertheless, he has no difficulty in condemning Pope Boniface.

¹ "Talis delatio . . . processerat ex solo fomite odiorum." *Ib.*

² *Cron.*, i, 20, 22; ii, 10, 22. Carried away by a false estimate of Boniface, Dr. Ragg, in his excellent *Dante and his Italy*, p. 30 f., writes: "The Commune replied [to the demand of Boniface that the accusers be sent to Rome] by electing the most prominent of these—the corrupt but astute L. S. to the dignity of prior of the Republic!" Unfortunately chronology is the death of such dramatic action. L. S., along with Dante, was Prior from Feb. Cf. M. Stefani, *Cron.*, p. 82.

interfere with the decrees of the Commune of Florence. Had they forgotten that the Roman Pontiff, the vicegerent of Christ, had been set over Kings and kingdoms, and had charge of all Christ's flock, so that any member of it in distress could turn to him for protection? To this ruler of the Church on earth every man must be subject, and when they do wrong (*cum delinquant*), take his corrections.¹ Otherwise there would be men who would live under no law, who would recognize no superior, and believe they could *sin* with impunity. Is not Florence subject to the Kings and Emperors of the Romans who are known to take an oath of fealty to us? Did not the Holy See, in the vacancy of the Empire, recently name King Charles of Sicily Vicar in Tuscany, and is not the Empire vacant now?

The Pope's correspondents are therefore directed to order *Lapus* (who ought rather to be called *lapis* *offensionis*, rock of offence) and the others, with a representative of the civic authority, to appear before him in eight days under pain of a general confiscation of Florentine goods throughout the world.²

The precise end of this affair does not appear to be recorded, but we are told that Lapo Saltarelli "greatly feared the Pope on account of the severe measures he had taken against him".³

¹ It is ordinary Christian doctrine that in spiritual things it is the will of God that all men should be subject to the Church of Christ; and it is ordinary Catholic doctrine that all the faithful are in like manner subject to the Pope, and hence, when they sin (*delinquant*), are liable to punishment by him. Boniface, however, after his lordly manner, speaks with an amplitude easily liable to misconception. The Pope's language is an echo of many of the publicists of his age, e.g., of Peter of Cremona (1301), who asserts: "*quod papa sit dominus universalis in toto mundo, quia omnes fideles sunt una ecclesia.*"

² *Reg.*, n. 3570; doc. iv ap. Levi.

³ Dino, ii, 10.

The Black
and White
factions.

All the civil difficulties ¹ of Florence were aggravated by rivalries between the Guelf families of the Cerchi and Donati, who took up the "White and Black" quarrels of Pistoia. In that city, a certain wealthy merchant, one Ser Cancellieri, had had two wives and a great many sons by both of them. Petty jealousies between the children of the different mothers ripened into bitter hatred. Their respective friends took part in the quarrel, and soon one party became known as the "Blacks" and the other as the "Whites" (*parte bianca e nera*), "forgetting among themselves the Guelf and Ghibelline parties." ² As a consequence, civil strife and loss of life ensued in Pistoia, and, afterwards, "the city of Florence and all Italy were contaminated by the said parties." The Florentines "fearing lest the said factions should damage the Guelf party", had, in the hope of pacifying the parties, brought a number of the leaders of both sides to their city. The only result was that the family quarrel was taken up in Florence itself. Vieri dei Cerchi and his family and friends joined the White party, and Corso Donati and his friends attached themselves to the Black party, and so, adds Villani, "all the city of Florence and its territory was divided. . . . Accordingly, the Guelf party, fearing lest the said parties should be turned to account by the Ghibellines, sent to Pope Boniface in order that he might find some remedy." ³

He at once summoned Vieri to him, and begged him to make peace with Corso Donati and his party, and to refer their differences to Rome. But though "in other things a sage knight", he showed no wisdom in his dealings with

¹ Cf. Villani, viii, 13.

² Villani, viii, 38.

³ *Ib.* Cf. Dino Comp., v, c. 25. He is not so clear as Villani. He notes that the Pistoians "are naturally quarrelsome, cruel, and savage men".

Boniface. By the obstinate and capricious position which he took up, he merely succeeded in rousing the Pope's indignation against himself and his party. When he returned to Florence, the animosity between the two parties went from bad to worse, and a beginning was made "of the great ruin of the Guelf party and of our city".¹

Boniface, however, who had a great esteem for the Florentines, calling them from their importance, "the world's fifth element," was full of anxiety about this split in the Guelf camp. He was the more anxious because Corso Donati, much more politic than Vieri, had succeeded in planting in his mind that the Cerchi were favouring the Ghibellines.² Moreover, according to Dino Compagni, the Roman agents of the Spini, who were the Pope's bankers and "Black", also impressed him with the same notion.³ Besides a deputation had come to him from "the Captains of the Guelf party and their council" to let him know that the fear about the Ghibellines rising to power was well founded, as already many of them had got into office, as well as members of the Black faction.⁴ Boniface, therefore, in May, 1300, dispatched to Florence as his legate cardinal Acquasparta in order to heal the schism. He chose him, he said, on account of his learning, prudence, and discretion, though he could ill afford to do without his presence. Nevertheless, acting on the advice of the cardinals, he sends him "as an angel of peace" to bring peace to the opposing parties.⁵

Cardinal Matteo was received "with great honour" by the Florentines (June, 1300), and with a view to lessening party spirit proposed a reform in the mode of electing the priors, as their election was regularly

¹ Villani, *l.c.*

² Dino, i, cc. 20 and 23.

³ *Ib.*, c. 21.

⁴ *L.c.*, c. 40.

⁵ *Reg.*, n. 3892, or in full, ap. Raynaldus, 1300, n. 24; May 23, 1300.

accompanied by great disorders. The names of all such as were worthy to be priors, irrespective of what party they belonged to, were to be put in a bag, and, when fresh priors were needed, the required number of names was to be drawn from the bag, "as chance would have it." But the White party which was in power at the moment, fearing to lose its position, and that the proposed scheme was a device of the Pope and the Cardinal to deprive them of it, "took the worse counsel," and would not agree. Such is Villani's story, which seems to square with the other authorities¹; but the "White" Dino pretends that the cardinal had come with the deliberate intention "of humbling the party of the Cerchi and of exalting the party of the Donati".² At any rate both historians are agreed that the Cardinal failed to reconcile the parties and went away in anger; and, according to Villani and Paolino Pieri, left Florence under an interdict.³

On the departure of the legate, Florence was "in evil state" indeed,⁴ as it was "very often in uproar and at arms".⁵ Accordingly, the "magnates and *popolani* of the faction of the Black party, with the captains of the Guelf party" who were of their mind, begged the Pope to invite some Prince of the House of France to come

Boniface
sends for
Charles of
Valois.

¹ *Chron.*, viii, 40. With Villani agrees P. Pieri, *Cron.*, p. 67. He puts down the failure of the efforts of Boniface and the Pope: "perche i Bianchi non vollero." He also says that the "Whites" "allora regger, erano signori". To the same effect speaks Leonardo of Arezzo, *Hist. Flor.*, iv, p. 89, ap. *R. I. SS.*, t. xix, new ed. "Itaque veriti (the Whites) ne voluntas legati ad adversarios inclinaret, operam ejus in constituenda republica aspernati sunt." When one remembers that Dante with all his violent party-passion was one of the members of the Government, one is the more sure that these historians are telling the truth. Cf. Boccaccio's *Life of Dante*, pp. 78-80, Eng. trans.

² *Cron.*, i, 21.

³ All this is confirmed by a letter of Boniface to the Cardinal. *Reg.*, n. 3899, July 22, 1300.

⁴ *Ib.*, c. 41.

⁵ *Ib.*, c. 42.

to Florence so that they might put down the Whites and the *de facto* government of the *Popolo*. Hearing of this, the Priors, of whom Dante was one, banished the heads of both parties, though those of the Whites were soon readmitted to the city. The Blacks, Corso Donati in particular, improved the occasion by getting into closer touch with the Pope, and still further impressing him with the Ghibelline danger. "By their zeal and industry," they so worked on Boniface that he sent for Charles of Valois, according to Villani, "principally for the aid of King Charles in his Sicilian war," but also that "he might use all his force to bring Florence to his purpose".¹

It may, however, be safer to follow the later, and seemingly more impartial, Leonardo Bruni, and to say that Boniface sent for Charles on account of the unequal treatment which the Priors (the government of the *Popolo*) had meted out to the exiled Whites and Blacks.² The Pope himself declared that he had summoned Charles because he felt "compelled" to seek help against the rebellious subjects of the Church, knowing that if their disorders were not quelled they would spread and become much worse.³

When, in due course, Charles drew nigh to Florence, those in power in the city, who, says Villani, though "they were of the White party, called themselves and

Charles comes to Florence, 1301.

¹ *Ib.*, c. 43. Pieri makes Charles come "ad prego di certi Toscani, e per commandamento del Papa di Roma." Pp. 67-8. Dino, ii, c. 2, too says that Boniface was persuaded to call in Charles by the "Blacks", suggesting that "the city was again falling into the hands of the Ghibellines, and would become a refuge for the Colonnas". He also adds that money was also used.

² See his *Vita di Dante*, Eng. trans., p. 125 (King's Classics). Boccaccio, in his *Life of Dante*, *ib.*, p. 78, gives much the same version of the summoning of Charles as Villani.

³ *Reg.*, n. 3917, Nov. 30, 1300. Potthast by mistake (n. 24992) refers this letter to Nov. 21.

desired to remain Guelfs",¹ were doubtful about admitting him into their midst. He, however, assured their envoys that he only came for the city's good, and to make peace among its citizens, and was accordingly allowed to enter the city (Nov., 1301).²

Things
become
worse.
Return of
the Cardinal,
1301.

With whatever intent Charles of Valois came to Florence, one thing is certain. He did not make all parties keep the law. It would even appear that he actually favoured the "Black" party, although Pieri throws the blame of the troubles that ensued after Charles's arrival on the Whites.³ At any rate, the disturbances in the city were greater after his arrival than before, and the "Black" party finally got control of the city.

In December, Cardinal Acquasparta returned to Florence, and again laboured hard to reconcile the parties. His return had been ordered by Boniface in a letter dated Dec. 2, 1301. In his letter to him the Pontiff told him how he had been informed of the disorders in "the noble province of Tuscany" which had increased to such an extent "that no one could get justice". For this reason he had, with the advice of his brethren, named Charles of Valois "preserver of the peace" in that part

¹ Villani, *ib.*, c. 49. The state of parties in Florence at this time is certainly very confusing. According to the late fourteenth century chronicler, Marchionne di Coppo Stefani, *Cron. Fiorentina*, the White party was composed of a number of important families or sections of them, and many of the *popolani minuti* (members of the lesser guilds) and almost all the Ghibellines. On the side of the Blacks were almost all the Guelf families of Florence. Ap. *R. I. SS.*, t. xxx, pt. i, p. 80, new ed.

² *Ib.* Cf. Dino, ii, cc. 6-9.

³ "Cercando Messer Carlo di far pace la parte Bianca non volle." *L.c.*, p. 68. So also says the author of the *Storie Pistoresi*, and he gives the reason. The Bianchi had the whole government of the city in their hands (*tutto signori*), and so were unwilling to concede anything. C. 11, p. 22, ap. *R. I. SS.*, xi, pt. v, new ed.

of Tuscany which is subject to the Empire. This he had done because the Empire was vacant at the moment ; because " it was well known " that, especially at such times, its " pacific preservation " pertained to him, and finally because he had full trust in " the strenuousness, military experience, and virtue " of Charles.

Charles had begun to do his work well, but that he might do it still better, and with " quiet and peace ", the Cardinal is ordered to betake himself to Tuscany with all speed and help to put an end to the warlike disturbances which have there increased beyond all bounds, and to bring peace to a province " agitated by so many impulses ".¹

At first the efforts of the legate were crowned with success. He arranged a number of marriages between members of the different parties, and succeeded in bringing about the much-needed peace. But his success was brief. As soon as he attempted to arrange a fair division of civic power, hostilities broke out again. This time opposition came from the Blacks, as they were in power, and the Cardinal left the city in the greatest disgust at the utter selfishness of its people (1302),² and returned to the Romagna whence he had come.

According to Dino, it would appear that Charles left Florence for Rome about the same time as Cardinal Acquasparta (c. Jan., 1302), and that during his absence a plot was hatched against his life.³ As far as the plot is concerned, Leonardo Bruni also speaks of it, but declares his belief that it was a trumped up affair.⁴ Whether then

A plot (?)
against
Charles,
1302.

¹ Ep. ap. Raynaldus, *Ann.*, 1301, Dec. 2 ; *Reg.*, 4434. From the Register we learn that similar letters were addressed to the clergy and laity of Tuscany.

² Villani, viii, 49 ; Pieri, p. 71 ; Stefani, p. 85.

³ ii, c. 25.

⁴ See his *Vita di Dante*, Eng. trans., pp. 125-6 (King's Classics). That Dante went on an embassy to Boniface to promote the cause

the plot was real or feigned, the Whites, including Dante who was absent on an embassy to Rome, were banished the city, and their property confiscated.¹ Thus, concludes Villani, whose sympathies are supposed to be "Black", "was abased and driven away the ungrateful and proud party of the Whites, in company with many Ghibellines of Florence, by Messer Carlo of Valois by commission of Pope Boniface on April 4, 1302, whence there came to our city of Florence much ruin."²

He goes to
Sicily.

In the same month, Charles himself left the city to take over the control of the forces of Charles II. in Sicily. He had, indeed, secured the triumph of the Black party; and so, from the great body of its constituents, the triumph of the Guelf or, at least nominally, Church party; but he had not brought peace to the city. The saying, therefore, which was current at the time, and which we have already quoted was true: "He came to Tuscany to bring it peace, and he left it at war. He went to Sicily to make war, and left it a disgraceful peace."³ Whatever financial profit may have accrued to Charles from his Italian expedition, he certainly won no honour or glory from it. In the main, too, he disappointed the hopes of Boniface both in Florence and Sicily, though he did succeed in removing any immediate danger of Ghibelline supremacy from Florence and "the province of Tuscany which so largely depends upon it".⁴

That Boniface, bearing in mind the donation of the famous countess Matilda of Tuscany, would have been

Boniface
did not plot
for
Tuscany.

of peace has, perhaps on insufficient grounds, been vigorously called in question. Cf. Boccaccio's *Life of D.*, *ib.*, p. 78; and Dino, ii, 25.

¹ Brunì, *l.c.* Cf. his *Hist. Florent.*, lib. iv. p. 92.

² *L.c.*, c. 49.

³ Villani, *l.c.*, c. 50; cf. *Ann. Cæsen.*, ap. *R. I. SS.*, xiv, p. 1122.

⁴ See the letter of Boniface to Cardinal Acquasparta, *Reg.*, n. 3899, July 22, 1300.

glad if the King of the Romans had granted him the whole province of Tuscany, we have already seen.¹ Had he not reason to believe that *of right* it belonged to the Holy See? Did he not know that, a hundred years before he had expressed to the duke of Saxony his wish to have all Tuscany, Innocent III. had written? "The Duchy of Tuscany belongs to the jurisdiction (ad jus et dominium) of the Roman Church; as by personal examination I know is set forth in the privileges of that Church."² But that Boniface ever *plotted* to recover the Duchy of Tuscany certainly cannot be proved by historical facts. That he ever did so was certainly unknown to his contemporaries, and has only been asserted by some modern writers on the ground of what one must describe as a free use of "critical" conjecture.³

¹ "P. Bon. volebat sibi dari totam Tusciam" is a note appended to an extant copy of the letter of Boniface to the Duke of Saxony quoted above.

² *Reg. Inn. III.*, i, 15, an. 1198. "Ducatus Tusciæ ad jus et dominium Ecclesiæ Romanæ pertinet, sicut in privilegiis E.R. oculata fide perspeximus contineri." Cf. *supra*, Vols. VII, p. 129 f.; VIII, pp. 74, 237 f.; IX, 40 f.; X, 129 f., 291; XI, p. 99, etc.

³ See what has been said above about Levi's paper on which many who make this assertion rely.

CHAPTER V.

THE STATES OF THE CHURCH. ROME. THE JUBILEE. ART.

Sources.—As usual, in connection with the States of the Church, of the first importance is the work of A. Theiner, *Codex Diplomaticus dominii temporalis S. Sedis*, Rome, 1861, 3 vols. Among many other documents belonging to the pontificate of Boniface VIII., which we shall quote, it contains (n. 537) a fragment of receipts and expenditure, connected with the pontifical exchequer, which passed through the hands of three Florentine banking companies, those of the Mozzi, Spini, and Chiarenti. A few years ago, a similar fragment of a Pistoian company, unfortunately in a very bad state of preservation, was found in the communal archives of Pistoia, and published by G. Zaccagnini in the *Bollettino Storico Pistoiese*, 1921, pp. 157–67. The Pistoian company, in touch with the Mozzi and Spini companies, had seemingly a smaller share in the pecuniary affairs of Boniface than the Florentine companies, and their accounts are kept not in Latin but in the vernacular, and regard part of the year 1302. Unfortunately the more important fragment in the *Codex* does not appear to have been known to Zaccagnini, for the two documents to some extent at least confirm and illustrate each other.

See also É. Molinier, *Inventaire du Trésor du Saint-Siège sous Boniface VIII.* (1295), Paris, 1888. It is an extract from *Bibliothèque de l'Ecole des Chartes*, 1882–8.

Extant minutes of papal letters previous to the fourteenth century are very rare. In the archives of the archbishops of Ravenna there are two such minutes of Boniface VIII. They are concerned with the occupation of Argenta by the party of the marquis of Este against the rights of the Church of Ravenna. They are published ap. *Archivio della Soc. Rom. di storia patria*, 1886, p. 621 ff.

Modern Works.—To those already quoted we will merely add : A. Muñoz, *Roma di Dante*, Milan-Rome, 1921.

H. Cochin, *Jubilés d'Italie*, Paris, 1911 (has but a page or two on the Jubilee of 1300); V. Prinzivalli, *Gli Anni Santi*, Rome, 1924; C. Carboni, *Il Jubileo di Bonifazio VIII. e la Comedia di Dante*, Rome, 1901, and especially H. Thurston, *The Holy Year of Jubilee*, London, 1900, a work we have freely used.

J. Guiraud, *L'église Romaine et les origines de la Renaissance*, Paris, 1904; C. Ricci, *Santi ed Artisti*, Bologna, 1910; E. Müntz, *Boniface VIII. et Giotto*, Rome, 1881, from *Mélanges d'archéologie et d'histoire*.

If Boniface made unceasing efforts to bring the blessings of peace and good government to countries and cities outside his personal jurisdiction, he naturally did not fail to strive to promote the prosperity of his own domains.

The dictum of Dante: "Never was thy Romagna without war,"¹ was certainly true in the days of Boniface VIII. Under the strong hand of Hildebrandinus, from 1290 to the pontificate of Celestine V., there had been peace in the Romagna; but under the short rule of his successor, Robert of Cornay (Oct., 1294-April, 1295), "the whole province was in rebellion."² His successor, Peter, archbishop of Monreale, would seem to have been equally unsatisfactory. He is said to have favoured the Ghibellines, and to have made "unfair treaties between the warring factions",³ which is perhaps the reason why, in later times, it was believed that, whereas "in Tuscany Boniface favoured the Guelfs, in Romagna he supported the Ghibellines"⁴.

Already, towards the end of March, 1295, Boniface had sent his chaplain, canon Richard of Ferentino, to carry out certain instructions issued in the pontificate of Boniface annuls the work of some of his officials.

¹ *Inf.*, c. 27.

² *Ann. Cæsen.*, p. 1110. Cf. *supra*, Vol. XVII, p. 195 ff. Cf. Pasolini, *I Tiranni di Romagna*, p. 53.

³ *Ann. C.*, p. 1111. "Faciendo inter discordantes inordinatas paces."

⁴ Cf. Bern. Azzurini, of Faenza († 1620), *Liber Rubeus*, p. 223, ap. *R. I. SS.*, t. xxviii, pt. iii, new ed.

Celestine, but especially to make peace between the people of Sinigaglia and those of Fossombrone.¹ But Richard and his chief, archbishop Peter, appear to have done their work badly—at any rate not to the satisfaction of the Pope. Boniface complained that absolutions, restitutions, and other such concessions which they had made had resulted in loss to the Holy See.² Richard, for instance, as we learn from a bull of the Pope, had been sent to see to the restitution of their property to Guido da Montefeltro and to those of his followers who like himself had submitted to Celestine. Not content with doing that, Richard had proceeded to absolve from censures such recalcitrant cities as Forlì and Cesena. Boniface accordingly deprived the transgressor of his honours, and annulled all that he had ventured to do on his own authority.³

A month or more before the issue of this bull, archbishop Peter⁴ had been superseded as Rector of the Romagna by the famous William Durandus, bishop of Mende, canonist, liturgist, and administrator, who thus for the second time took control of the unruly province.⁵ For the special work of undoing the presumptuous deeds of Richard of Ferentino, Boniface dispatched to the province Guido of Langasco, bishop of Pavia.⁶ Accordingly the new Rector, acting with Guido, deprived

¹ *Reg.*, n. 735–8, March 23–8, 1295. ² *Reg.*, n. 842, Nov. 27, 1295.

³ *Reg.*, n. 836, Nov. 27, 1295; in full in Theiner, *Cod. Dip.*, i, n. 500, p. 330. “Capellanie et familiaritatis nostre honore privantes.” Cf. *Reg.*, nn. 837 ff. Cf. Peter Cantinelli, *Chron.*, p. 78.

⁴ Cf. Pasolini, *l.c.*, p. 56.

⁵ Cf. *Reg.*, n. 839, Nov. 27, 1295, where Boniface calls William “virum utique magni consilii.” Cf. nn. 943–4, about the release of hostages.

⁶ *Reg.*, nn. 837–42, Nov. 27, 1295. Somewhat later, March 12, 1296, *Reg.*, n. 1569, he was ordered to make strict but quiet inquiry into all the acts of Peter and Richard, and especially of the former's nephew, Nicholas, known as *Egiptius*. Cf. n. 1570, and also n. 942.

Cesena, Forli, and Faenza, and all persons in them who were in a league against the Roman Church, of all their privileges, honours, and dignities (1296).¹ On the pretext that the bishop was a friend of the Polentani of Ravenna, the Manfredi and other Ghibelline families, the cities appealed to the Pope (Apr., 1296).² Boniface had, however, meanwhile commissioned bishop Guido to order in the Pope's name Guido, Corradus, and Galassus, counts of Montefeltro, Malatesta of Verculo, and Maghinardus of Susignano to come to Rome in person along with deputies of Forli, Cesena, etc., in order that their differences might be settled by the Pope himself.³

None of these measures appear to have brought peace to the disturbed province. William Durandus died in November of this year (1296), and whilst it was "still in rebellion", cardinal Acquasparta went to that "nest of serpents" as its Rector "in temporals and spirituals", towards the close of the year 1300.⁴

Cardinal
Acquasparta
as Rector
of the
Romagna.

Before entering the province he had held a meeting at Bologna in the bishop's palace of the representatives of Forli, Faenza, Imola, Cesena, and other cities, and had arranged with them various preliminaries that would simplify the drawing up of the final peace conditions. Thus arrangements were made for the temporary suspension of legal processes and ecclesiastical censures, etc.⁵ He then held "a general parliament" at Canacasia, between Faenza and Ravenna,

¹ *Ann. Cæsen.*, ap. *R. I. SS.*, xiv, p. 1113.

² *Cf.* B. Azzurrini, *Lib. Rub.*, i, pp. 115 and n. 201, and docs. from the Vat. Archives, *ib.*, p. lxi.

³ *Ep. Jan.* 26, 1296, ap. Theiner, *l.c.*, n. 502. *Cf. Reg.*, nn. 946-7. On some of the deeds of Maghinardus, *cf.* B. Azzur., *l.c.*, pp. 105, 115, 218 ff.

⁴ *Ann. Foroliv.*, p. 58, and *Ann. Cæsen.*, p. 1121.

⁵ See what is described as the "Instrumentum compositionis et absolutionis factæ a . . . rectore Romandiolæ cum civibus Forolivii etc.," of Dec. 3, 1300, ap. Theiner, *l.c.*, n. 551.

at which were present count Frederick, son of the famous Guido da Montefeltro, "captain of Cesena," Maghinardus Paganus, captain of Forli, Faenza, and Imola, along with their ambassadors.¹ It does not appear that much good in the way of peace resulted from this parliament, but still the Rector was able to effect some good, or, at any rate, had some success. Headed by Raul "de Mazolinis", the people of Cesena drove out the Ghibelline Frederick, son of the famous Guido da Montefeltro, so that the cardinal was able to enter their city, and to appoint a suitable "Captain of the people".² Boniface followed up his action by sternly forbidding Frederick and the other nobles whom the people had expelled to return to the city.³ Unfortunately the cardinal did not remain long in the province, and his successor, James Paganus, bishop of Rieti, proved worse than useless, and was deprived by the Pope of his bishopric for his disgraceful conduct.⁴ He was the nominee of Charles of Valois, to whom Boniface had given the title of Rector of the Romagna (Sept. 3, 1301), as was also the man who succeeded him, Raynaldus, bishop of Vicenza. Absolutely devoted to the cause of peace, he was badly wounded when the Ordelaffi seized Forli.⁵ He made, however, a miraculous recovery, reconciled the contending parties, and at length became archbishop of Ravenna (Nov. 19, 1303).⁶

Troubles in
other
Provinces.

If the most serious troubles in the Papal States during the pontificate of Boniface were in the Romagna, there

¹ *Ann. Foroliv.*, p. 58.

² *Ann. C.*, l.c.,

³ Ep. of Apr. 1, 1303, ap. Theiner, n. 566.

⁴ *Ann. Cæsen.*, p. 1122. Cf. a letter of Charles of Valois condemning the conduct of his "vicar-general", and annulling his acts. Ep. of Apr. 4, 1302, from Florence, ap. B. Azzurrini, *Liber Rubeus*, pp. 185-6.

⁵ *Ann. C.*, p. 1123.

⁶ Cf. *Rubeus, Hist. Ravennat.*, p. 505 ff.

were naturally troubles in the March of Ancona, and the Duchy of Spoleto, if only because they abutted on it. Ever working for peace, we find Boniface ordering the Rector of the March of Ancona ¹ to take over and guard for the Roman Church the fortress which the people of Recanati had built at Montalis.² At one moment we see him making peace between Todi and Perugia,³ or between Todi and Orvieto,⁴ and at another forbidding Perugia, Todi, Spoleto, and Narni forming one of those leagues condemned by canon and civil law alike.⁵

Then it is the fiery little hill-town of Orvieto that again Orvieto. engages his close attention. With reference to its struggles with the various authorities in the valley of the Lake of Bolsena, and with Aquapendente, Boniface decided certain points in its favour. The valley Communes had to help Orvieto in time of war, and, except against the Roman Church, had to allow a free passage for its men through their territories. Each Commune was also bound every year to present to the city as a sign of homage a banner (*palleum*) on the first Thursday of Lent, and a wax candle of twenty-five pounds weight on the feast of our Lady's Assumption.⁶ The name of Boniface is also connected with the cathedral of Orvieto, one of the glories not only of Italy, but of the world. The bishop and chapter had informed the Pope that they had begun to build their cathedral, but that its cost would be greater than the city could bear. In accordance,

¹ *Reg.*, n. 740.

² Potthast, n. 24163, Aug. 11, 1295.

³ Theiner, *Cod. Dip.*, i, n. 504.

⁴ *Ib.*, n. 557.

⁵ *Ib.*

⁶ Ap. *Regesto degli Atti del Commune*, p. 115; cf. *Annales Urbevet.*, ap. *ib.*, p. 170, in *Ephemerides Urbevet.*, ap. R. I. SS., tom. xv, pt. v. Similar privileges with regard to Aquapendente were granted to Orvieto. *Ib.* See the documents in full, ap. Theiner, *l.c.*, nn. 505-6.

therefore, with their wishes, Boniface made a general appeal on their behalf, and offered an indulgence of one hundred days to anyone who would help in its erection.¹

The people of Orvieto were not ungrateful to Boniface for his favours—favours the more remarkable that the city had been acting in opposition to the Holy See in their relations with the Communes of Aquapendente and those of the Valley of Lake Bolsena.² Boniface was not only made “Captain” or Podestà, but two statues were erected to him, and placed, one over the porta Maggiore, and the other over the porta Postieria. The former is still *in situ*, but the other, very much mutilated, is now preserved in the city museum.³ The local authorities further resolved (1297) that the arms of Boniface should be painted on the façade of their town hall, and that, if the statues could not be finished before the Pope’s arrival in their midst, a portrait of him “in good style” should be painted in the meanwhile.⁴ In the same year too, they pulled down the old episcopal palace, and built a new one for the Pope.

Boniface
favourable
to the
Communes.

Speaking generally, Boniface showed himself favourable to the Communes in the Papal territories. While aiming

¹ *Reg.*, n. 2208, “opere quamplurimum sumptuoso.” “Omnibus qui devote constructioni . . . adjuverint, centum dies de injunctis penitentiis relaxantur.”

² *Cf.* Theiner, *Cod. Dip.*, i, n. 492, a letter written by the College of Cardinals (Apr. 12, 1294), during the vacancy of the Holy See warning the people of O. not to interfere with those Communes. The trouble had at one time become so acute that Boniface had ordered all the clergy except those necessary to give the last sacraments to leave the city. *Cf. Ann. Urbev.*, p. 164. See also, *ib.*, pp. 164–8, and the documents cited in the notes, and p. 134.

³ *Ib.*, p. 170.

⁴ See the ordinance of Apr. 17, 1297, from the city archives, quoted *ib.*, n. 3. In 1298 Boniface acquired houses and a tower in the city. *Cf. ib.*, p. 171, n. 3.

at maintaining Guelf supremacy in them,¹ he gave them various privileges which protected them against the Rectors or improved their condition. Processes, for instance, against certain Communes could be dropped if they would make peace with one another,² Assisi could enlarge its boundaries,³ statutes of Communes were confirmed by which, in order to protect themselves from the nobles, it was decreed that houses could not be sold to nobles from other places,⁴ and decrees of Rectors against privileges which he had granted to different Communes were declared null and void.⁵ A very important concession which he made to the civic authorities in the "Patrimony of Blessed Peter in Tuscany" was the right to exercise "merum et mixtum imperium", as it was called. In his bull of Jan. 20, 1299, after setting forth that the right of "merum et mixtum imperium", or that of civil and criminal jurisdiction, in papal Tuscany belonged to the Holy See, Boniface granted that power, "during its pleasure," to all those Communes which had had the right of electing their own magistrates. He granted the officials of the Communes this power in order to enable them the more easily to maintain order and punish crime. Cases, however, of heresy, treason, forgery of papal documents or of money, and of rape, were to be excepted. The Rector of the Patrimony was forbidden to interfere with the just exercise of the privileges which had been conceded, or to charge the Communes for the safekeeping of the

¹ Hence he sent cardinal Napoleon Orsini to drive out the Ghibelline nobles who had seized Gubbio. *Cf. Ann. Cæsen.*, p. 1120; P. Pieri, p. 67, etc.

² Theiner, *Cod. Dip.*, i, n. 493.

³ *Ib.*, n. 495. *Cf.* 497-8, 500.

⁴ *Ib.*, nn. 507-8.

⁵ *Ib.*, nn. 510-11.

public roads if they had taken them over and had devoted reasonable care to their safety. Boniface, we may here remark, was far from neglecting the safety of the roads, as may be inferred from his letter to Magister Leo, canon of St. Peter's (March 10, 1298). By it, he placed the care of the bridge of Nepi in the hands of the canon, and, to secure the safety of the roads, he ordered him to destroy the tower, and all the fortifications in connection with it.¹

Moreover, to return to the bull we are citing, if reasonable bail were offered, the Rector was not to detain at his court at Montefiascone (or elsewhere) the Syndics of the Communes or others who for judicial purposes had to go thither; nor was he in any way to hinder appeals. Though the hearth-tax (*focaticum*) had to be paid as before, the Rector was only to be allowed to exact "Procurations" when he made a personal visit to the Communes, and he was not to exact more than had been the recognized amount during the past thirty or forty years.

For the more easy securing of justice, Boniface laid down in this same bull that, in trials, the name of the accuser, and the nature of the charge must be clearly stated in the indictment; only sworn witnesses were to be heard, and the legal costs were not to be excessive. By these and by further regulations regarding the exportation of grain and regarding appeals, etc., Boniface showed how thoroughly he had at heart the prosperity of his people.²

¹ Potthast, n. 24636.

² Theiner, *l.c.*, n. 528, a document of the first importance for the study of the internal administration of the States of the Church. With it compare: (1) "a constitution" regarding the March of Ancona (*ib.*, n. 571), whence among other useful items of information contained in it, we learn that a "registered" apostolic indult cost twice as much

Again, "during the pleasure" of the Holy See, certain revenues were assigned to some Communes,¹ and, what we should not have expected from a ruler who, according to some, thought only of amassing money, he forbade the putting of any place subject to the Holy See under an interdict for the non-payment of any pecuniary dues whatsoever.²

Finally, as we cannot enumerate all the regulations made by Boniface in the interest of the people, we will add but one more. He required that all officials, when they laid down their offices, should remain in the Rector's court for the following ten days to answer any charges that might be brought against them on the score of any form of maladministration.³

Boniface's goodwill in their behalf was greatly appreciated by the Communes. Bologna erected a statue to him in the corn exchange.⁴ Orvieto, as we have seen, erected two statues to him; and Rome, Orvieto, Corneto, Velletri, Toscanella, etc., elected him their Senator or Podestà as the case might be.⁵

Statues and honours for the Pope.

as one not registered, and that Rectors were not to interfere with lay folk hunting in the proper way with dogs, or beds, or nets. (2) The privileges granted to the Communes of Campania and the Maritima (whose devotion to the Roman Church is highly praised) in the bull of Sept. 28, 1295, "*Romana Mater Ecclesia*," quoted and confirmed by Boniface IX. (June 12, 1400). Ap. *Bullar. Rom.*, iv, p. 629.

¹ *Ib.*, nn. 529-30.

² *Ib.*, n. 562. Cf. n. 563, by which Boniface appointed a fiscal advocate to deal with pecuniary cases against the Holy See or any of its officials.

³ *Ib.*, n. 571.

⁴ "In palacio bladi," ap. *Corpus Chron. Bonon.*, ii, 260; "versus plateam quia studium posuit et confirmavit Bononie" adds the *Chron.* of Jerome de Bursellis, ap. *R. I. SS.*, xxiii, p. 35, new ed. The statue is now in the civic museum.

⁵ For Rome, Theiner, *Cod. Dip.*, i, n. 516; Orvieto, *Ephem. Urb.*, p. 170; Corneto, Theiner, *l.c.*, n. 544; Velletri, *ib.*, n. 535; Toscanella, *ib.*, n. 517; Pisa, *ib.*, n. 501.

But
Romans
ungrateful.

But, if there was ingratitude anywhere, it was among the Romans, if, indeed, we can rely on an item of Roman news preserved by one of our chronicles, that of Lanercost. "At the beginning of Lent (Ash Wednesday, Feb. 27, 1297), so great was the scarcity in Rome, that the citizens, knowing that the stores (depositum) of the Church were laid up in the Capitol, broke into it, and plundered the corn and salt which they found there, forcing their way in with such violence that sixty of them were crushed to death, after the manner of the famine of Samaria (4 Kings, vii, 17). And because the Pope appointed a certain senator against their will, they would with one accord have set fire to the papal palace, and oppressed the Father of the Church, had it not been for the exertions of a certain cardinal who calmed their madness, and caused the Pope to alter his decision."¹

Of these acts there does not appear to be any other direct notice; but it is just possible that a fact recorded by Vitale² may suggest that Boniface wished to appoint a relative of his, and that in the bull by which he named Pandulf Savelli Senator for the third time (March 13, 1297),³ he alludes to these disturbances. At any rate, in appointing Pandulf, who, we know, was still Senator in July, 1297,⁴ he avers that the Romans are "the special wards of the Church", whose honour he eagerly strives for, "whose adversity distresses him, and whose disorder (turbatio) afflicts him." He nominated Pandulf, he added, to give justice to all, and "to repress the attempts of the malignant".

Boniface
strengthens
his position
in Rome.

Anyone who has read the story of the mediaeval Popes will know that the example we have just given of violent

¹ *Chron.*, i, p. 189; Eng. trans., p. 162.

² *Senatori di Roma*, i, p. 205.

³ *Reg.*, n. 2334, but much better in Theiner, *l.c.*, n. 516.

⁴ From an authentic doc. in Vitale, *l.c.*

behaviour on the part of the Romans is far from being an isolated one. It is simply another manifestation of their natural turbulence. Knowing right well their character, Boniface did not imitate the weakness of Nicholas IV. in dealing with them. He strove to get a firm grip of Rome, and to that end obtained possession of strong places in it. Already for centuries the Mausoleum of Augustus had been turned into a fortress. It had long been in the hands of the Colonnas, and of course had been much damaged in faction fights, and perhaps also by the makers of lime.¹ This "fortress" was bought by Boniface who "caused it to be enlarged and rebuilt at great cost".²

He also acquired the Torre delle Milizie, still the most formidable looking tower in Rome, and said to have been built by Gregory IX. "on the remains of Trajan's buildings, known in the Middle Ages as Balnea Pauli (Magnanopli)".³ Partly destroyed by Brancaloneone (1257), it was repaired at great expense by Boniface,⁴ and put into the hands of his nephew, Peter, count of Caserta.⁵

In one of the reports of Geran de Albalato to James II. which has often been quoted before, we read that, after a certain consistory, cardinal Gerard and several other cardinals went to inspect the Torre and observed to its owner what a splendid place it was. To this Peter agreed, but added that cost prevented him from perfecting it. Whereupon, on the spot, the cardinal caused a deed to be drawn up granting him property in the neighbourhood of Viterbo to the amount of over twelve thousand florins,

¹ Cf. Rodocanachi, *Les monuments de Rome*, pp. 28, 30-31, and 97 ff.

² Villani, *Chron.*, viii, 6. Cf. G. Gaetani, *Domus G.*, i, ch. 19.

³ Lanciani, *The Golden Days of the Renaissance in Rome*, p. 53, London, 1906.

⁴ *Mart. Polon. cont. Brabant.*, ap. M. G. SS., xxiv, p. 261.

⁵ Villani, *l.c.*

in order that such "a magnificent piece of work" should be finished.

This transaction, adds Geran, caused a good deal of talk against the cardinal, but some said that he could not well help acting as he had done.¹

This same nephew was, moreover, made by the Pope the commander of the city's militia, and helped to acquire great estates in Campagna and the Maritima. Such places as Sermoneta (the ancient Sulmo) and Norma on the slopes of the mountains of Latium, and Ninfa in the valley, which still belong to the Gaetani family, thus came into Peter's hands.²

Don Gelasio Gaetani calculates from the existing deeds of sale that the purchase of Sermoneta, Bassiano, and S. Donato, Norma and Ninfa must have cost the family over 400,000 gold florins, i.e., over 140 million Italian lire of to-day (1925).³ In the course of the acquisition of this immense property, Don Gelasio is prepared to admit that, in the accusations made against Pope Boniface with regard to the acquiring of these estates, those may be true which allege that some of the owners of them were forced to sell. But there is no proof whatsoever that those who sold their lands and rights did not receive full monetary value.⁴

¹ Finke, *Aus dem T.*, p. liv.

² "Et castrum Nymphæ (Ninfa), Ostiensis et Velletrensis diocesis, in perpetuum feudum concedit, ea lege ut quædam possessiones in agro Urbevetano sitas, Ecclesiæ Romanæ cedat." Anagni, Oct. 2, 1300. *Reg.*, n. 3902. On these purchases from the Anibaldi, etc., cf. G. Gaetani, *Domus G.*, p. 114, and *Reg. Chart.*, i, pp. 98-101.

³ *Domus G.*, i, p. 123. In English money of the same date (1925), the sum in Italian lire would have been equivalent to about £1,400,000.

⁴ *Ib.*, p. 75. Cf. Dupuy, *Hist.*, p. 334, for the accusations under this head. Whoever wishes for complete information on the land purchases of Boniface and the Gaetani during his pontificate, must consult the *Domus G.*

With the approval of his uncle, Peter also acquired from the Anibaldi the Castrum S. Felicis, and the whole district of Monte Circeo; and he also bought property in and about Terracina, with all the lands, houses, and fortresses, etc., belonging to them, and with the jurisdiction, civil and criminal, that went with them, and with the right of patronage over all the churches in those districts. All this, exclusive of the Terracina property, he bought for twenty thousand gold florins.¹

Count Peter gets property in the Maritima.

When Peter had finished his purchases, they were all confirmed to him by the Pope (Feb. 10, 1303).²

Boniface also tried, but to no purpose, to obtain from Charles II. that Count Peter should hold Gaëta as a fief of the Church and not of the kingdom.³ Moreover, if Court gossip, on which only the preceding item also rests, is to be trusted, the Pope proposed to revive in Peter's behalf the title of "Patricius of the Romans". Now this dignity, explained the envoy to his master, "is the greatest in Italy after that of the Emperor, and when the Empire is vacant the Patricius has his rights." Boniface, we are assured, was preparing a gold crown for him,⁴ when the death of cardinal Gerard and other business caused the scheme to be laid aside for the time.⁵

¹ "Pro pretio viginti milium florenorum auri," not for 200,000 as Gregorovius (*Rome*, v, p. 583) has it. See the bull of Boniface, Jan. 28, 1302, ap. Theiner, *Cod. D.*, i, p. 382, which includes the deed of sale, drawn up in the Lateran palace. Cf. *ib.*, n. 560, for the Terracina sale. The T. property was bought from the Frangipani for 1,000 florins. This deed was signed "in domibus militiarum in Lobia, juxta salam majorem".

² *Reg.*, n. 5338. "Cum tu in Campanie ac Maritime partibus castra Trebarum, etc., Carpineti, etc., et Asture . . . de nostra conscientia acquisivisse" etc. Cf. Gregorovius, *l.c.*, p. 580 ff., for further details from the Gaetani archives.

³ Finke, *Aus dem T.*, p. xlv.

⁴ And also "cubas de argento".

⁵ Finke, *l.c.*, p. lvi.

Possessions
for other
nephews or
grand-
nephews.

But the count of Caserta was not the only member of the family who benefited by the goodwill or bounty of Boniface. Peter's brother, Francis, was not only made cardinal-deacon of S. Maria in Cosmedin (1295), but he was permitted to be a pluralist, holding among other livings the archdeaconry of Richmond in the diocese of York,¹ and, for him, as for his father and brothers, the laws which forbade the bestowal of lands in Campania and the Maritima on nobles in Rome were repealed, and he was allowed to acquire castles and lands and rights in those parts.²

By acquiring (1302) the property known as the *Capo di Bove*, there passed into the hands of the cardinal the picturesque tomb of Cecilia Metella, which had been converted into a fortress to command the approach to Rome by the Via Appia. When he acquired the property, there were other buildings in its vicinity, but the cardinal completed the fortifications of the tomb and other works near it, and built the Gothic church, the ruins of which are still to be seen on the side of the road opposite the Church.³ Great damage was done to the famous tomb by the Colonnas out of hatred for the Gaetani, when, in conjunction with the Emperor, Henry VII., it was captured by them in 1312.

Favours were also heaped by Boniface on Peter's sons,

¹ *Reg.*, n. 5340, Feb. 24, 1303.

² *Ib.*, n. 5339, Feb. 10, 1303.

³ Cf. G. Digard, "Le domaine des Gaetani au tombeau de Cecilia Metella," p. 281 ff. in *Mélanges G. B. de Rossi*, Paris and Rome, 1892. His authorities are two sets of documents attached to the Register of Boniface VIII. (fols. 393-401 and fols. 402-11). Cf. Tommasseti, *La Campagna Romana*, ii, p. 66, and C. Borgnana, *Del castello e della chiesa dei Gaetani nella Via Appia*, Rome, 1866, citing a MS. from Marini: "Franciscus card. S. M. in C. in loco qui dicitur caput bovis construxit castrum cum Ecclesia in honorem B. Nicolai . . . cui Bonifacius VIII. concessit jura parochialia et patronatum sibi et suis successoribus" Cf. G. Gaetani, *Domus G.*, i, c. xx.

Benedict and Loffred Gaetani. The latter was helped to marry the heiress of the county of Fondi,¹ which materially increased the power of the Pope in the neighbourhood of Terracina. "By means of a golden cup and the banners of the counties in question," Benedict Gaetani was duly invested with the great fief of which had been deprived Margaret, the daughter of Hildebrand, count Palatine in Tuscany.² In April, 1303, the same grand-nephew was made Rector of the Patrimony, and further property was secured to him.³

It will be observed that most of the efforts of Boniface to increase the power of his family were made after the year 1297, when his difficulties with the Colonnas came to a head. The material resources of this hostile family were so great that, to no inconsiderable extent, at any rate, Boniface must have felt himself as it were forced to aggrandize his own family, in order to be able to offer an effective resistance to his unscrupulous foes.

Still, it is certain that many years before he became Pope, Boniface used the revenues which his many benefices brought him for the acquisition of landed property. As protonotary, he bought lands in the district of Anagni,⁴ and as cardinal, he made many purchases of land in the district of Selvamolle in the diocese of Ferentino.⁵ Other properties were given to the cardinal by Charles II. of Naples in gratitude for all that he did for him in France

¹ Finke, *Mon. Arag.*, i, n. 50, p. 69 ff.

² *Reg.*, 5334, March 13, 1303. *Cf. ib.*, n. 5333, March 9, 1303, which gives the reasons why Margaret's fiefs had been confiscated, and shows that the decision against her had been given "cum debita maturitate".

³ *Reg.*, 5337, Apr. 18, 1303, and n. 5336.

⁴ G. Gaetani, *Domus G.*, i, p. 92. *Cf.* p. 93, for his purchase of Norma for 26,500 golden florins.

⁵ *Ib. Regesta Chart.*, i, p. 76. In these purchases he expended not less than 9,600 pounds of the money of the Senate.

when, as legate, he worked for peace between that country and Aragon.¹ However, as we learn from cardinal Francis Gaetani, Boniface made all these estates over to his nephew Loffred before he became Pope.²

Nevertheless, this work of making his family powerful landowners, of providing its members with great estates, if not indeed with "states", Boniface, as we have seen, continued when he became Pope.

Unfortunately, we do not know what was the amount of the papal revenue on which Boniface could draw in order to enable him to provide funds for the general management of the Church; for the recovery of Sicily; for his works of charity and beneficence; for his patronage of the arts, and for the needs of his household and his relatives. Only a page or two of the account books connected with his treasury have hitherto been discovered. Theiner has, however, printed from the "*Liber Introitum et Exitum cameræ et palatii Apostolici*", items of Receipts and Expenditure for the year 1299.³ This fragment lets us see at least the principal sources of the Pope's revenue at this period. Following, more or less, the chronological order in which the receipts came in, we find that one source was such taxes as the "commune servitium"; another, rents from such property as mills, etc.; then fees for registration of bulls, pecuniary acknowledgments for fiefs both from individuals,⁴ and from Communes, and for concessions of immunities; taxes, one thousand nine hundred and four gold florins, twenty-two solidi, and three denarii from the county of Venaissin, all in money of Provins; Peter's Pence from

¹ See the documents in *D.G.*, i, pp. 92-3.

² See his reply to the Colonnas, ap. Mohler, *Die Kard.*, p. 232.

³ *Cod. Dip.*, i, n. 537, p. 360 ff.

⁴ E.g., ten byzants of gold from Peter de Vico for Vetula and Bieda.

England¹; and lastly donations or subscriptions, e.g., a subscription of thirty gold florins from the Commune of Perugia for the war against the Colonnas.

From this document, it might be thought for a moment that, for the year 1299, the papal revenue at a rough calculation was not as much as seventeen thousand pounds, of which the "Commune servitium" brought in more than half, some eight thousand four hundred and forty-four pounds; the "Census" (taxes, or acknowledgments) some three thousand eight hundred and forty pounds; the registration, etc., of letters four hundred and twelve pounds; voluntary subscriptions, refunds, and exceptional sources, one thousand seven hundred and fifty-four pounds; the receipts from the county of Venaissin about the same amount, while rents from property only brought in about six pounds.² When, however, from this same document, we find the revenue for 1302 working out at only about two thousand nine hundred pounds, it is clear that there is no question in this extract of the whole of the papal revenue for a year. Only that portion of it is dealt with which passed through the hands of some of the papal bankers (mercatores).³

Turning to the pay sheet of this document, we find payments for food and wine, for almsgiving, salaries, etc. Items of expenditure.

¹ £257 18s. 8d. representing part of the annual Peter's Pence, and some other taxes, paid in by Master Giffard, "now bishop of Parma."

² In making this rough calculation, we have taken the gold florin as equivalent to eleven shillings; and, in the case of the few payments made in byzants, we have taken the byzant as equivalent to a florin, whereas our document tells us that 22½ florins were equal to 30 byzants. We have also supposed the pounds of the money of Provins, of Ravenna, etc., to be of equal value.

³ "Incipiunt recepta Camera ipsius (Boniface) per manus mercatorum trium societatum . . . Rev. dño. Theoderico Card. Camerario existente." The conclusion in the text is, of course, confirmed by the fact that the Pistoian fragment also deals with payments and receipts for the year 1302.

The papal household must have been fairly large, as the expenses for fish, flesh, etc., and fuel for the first week in February amounted to over one thousand and fifty-six pounds, exclusive of the charges for corn and wine. Then there were items for lighting, silk for the bullæ, and thirty-five grossos for "Hugh and Orlannucius¹ who go to Anticole, Fuggi, for water for our lord the Pope", along with forty-four solidi for the expenses of the animals who carried the said water. Payments are also entered for the carriage of the chests "for the tithes and the Registers", and for the repairs of the houses of officials; so that the total expenses of the first week in February amounted to over two thousand eight hundred pounds, and three hundred and forty-two florins. Among the interesting expenses for other weeks, there is an item for a horse put at the disposal of master Thomas of Parma, who was sent to the March of Ancona on the occasion of raising an army against the Colonnas. Sixteen solidi of Provins are paid to Constantius for "four pairs of linen buskins (caligæ) for our lord", twenty-five florins "for bread and water for prisoners", and eight florins "for winter clothing of which he was lacking" to brother Andrew, the penitentiary. Eleven hundred and forty-three pounds of lead for the bullæ, and yards of waxed linen "for the windows of our lord at Anagni", and eight hundred pounds "of paper for the Chancellery" had all to be paid for. The Easter donations to the clergy, the papal household, the primicerius and the rest of the city judges, the notaries, and to the Greek

¹ "Orlanduccio," "che rega l'acqua d'Antichole," also figures in the Pistoian fragment, p. 161; and both he and his companion, on p. 165. The waters of Antichole or Fuggi were useful for stone from which Boniface suffered. Cf. an article (quoted by F. Fede) by R. Morghen, "Malattie vecchie e cure nuove nella vita d'un gran papa" in the *Popolo Romano*, Nov. 10, 1921.

deacon and subdeacons of Grottaferrata also required no little money. For a second and third time, we meet with payments in connection with the Colonnas—with the destruction of Palestrina, the construction of Civitas papalis, and with the dispatch of *cursores* carrying processes against them to different parts. Finally, sixteen florins were paid “for a charger (*destrarius*) for the lord when he entered the city”; forty-six pounds, odd, for Latin and Greek wine for our lord, and for the Chamberlain (*Camerarius*) and clergy, as well as for sugar and spices “for claret” (*pro clareto*) for our lord; and one hundred and eighteen florins “for sixteen pounds of silver to make stands for our lord’s candelabras”.

Items in this financial document remind one that at Venaissin. this period the most distant portion of the papal domain was the county of Venaissin of which we have spoken before. It figures both among the receipts and the expenses just discussed. In this province, Boniface took great interest. On June 5, 1300, he appointed as its Rector, “both in spirituals and temporals,” Master Matthew, canon of Chieti, and exhorted him so to conduct himself in ruling it, that the province would rejoice in its ruler, and that he himself might advance in the Pope’s favour.¹ He granted him and the county various rights. In response to a request he granted him permission to strike new money for the province, but it had to be “such good money that there would never be any need to recall it”.² Of this “new money” some few specimens have survived to our time. Serafini, in his

¹ *Reg.*, n. 3619. He had previously (Feb. 1, 1297) put the Rectorship “in commission” (*cf.* nn. 1659–60), and given orders for the destruction of fortresses opposed to the interests of the government. *Cf.* n. 1568.

² *Ib.*, n. 3620. This letter, looking “ad statum felicem et prosperum comitatus Venesini (in the same doc. also Venaysini) R. Ecclesiæ pleno jure subjecti”, is that of a most enlightened ruler.

magnificent work on the papal coins,¹ has described one or two of them. One, a silver grosso, coming from the Sorignes mint, bears on the obverse round the edge the inscription, "† Domini. BO. PAPA." In the centre there is a rude portrait of the Pope turned a little to the left. The bust is shown with a mitre wearing a mantle or cope fastened with a brooch ornamented with a cross, and holding a key in the right hand. The reverse has round the edge the words, "† COITAT. VENAUSIN." The centre is taken up with a large cross, in the top right angle of which is the letter B.

Boniface also granted that the people of the province, as long as they were ready to submit to their [local Ordinaries and to the Rector, should not by apostolic letters be summoned at great trouble and expense before other judges.² On the other hand the Rector was commanded to enforce the canonical laws against clerics attempting matrimony or engaging in secular pursuits, and to expel from the county all aliens and Jews who were practising usury.³ Finally, in response to a deputation from the county, Boniface ordered the Rector to see to it that the recognized customs of the county should be observed under the Church government, as they had been before.⁴

Spiritual
work of
Boniface.

Returning to Rome from which finance has led us away, we may now contemplate Boniface attending to its spiritual and artistic needs. To increase the dignity of divine service in St. Peter's, of which he had himself been a canon, Boniface increased the number of its canons and beneficiaries, and to provide them with

¹ *Le Monete e Bolle Pontificie*, by C. Serafini, Milan, 1910 ff. See vol. i, p. 66, and tav. xi, n. 1. See also his supplementary vol.

² *Ib.*, n. 3618.

³ *Ib.*, nn. 3617 and 3621.

⁴ *Ib.*, n. 3617.

suitable stipends, assigned to them farms and other property "bought with his own money".¹ The canons were not ungrateful for "the great benefits and the bountiful gifts" which they had received from the Pope and his nephew, cardinal Benedict. They reckoned that, apart from lands, houses, etc., which Boniface had given them "before he became Pope and after", he had expended forty-four thousand three hundred and sixty-five gold florins in their behalf. By solemn deed, therefore, they bound themselves to say for him and his nephews prayers and Masses in the Chapel which he had made in St. Peter's and elsewhere both during their lives and in perpetuity after their death.²

For similar reasons he also granted the Chapter of St. John Lateran "that palace within the city walls, commonly known as the Anterinanum" which belongs of full right (*pleno jure*) to the Roman Church.³

To foster the ancient devotion of the *stations*, instituted, said Boniface, "as antiquity tells," by Pope Gregory I., and already blessed by that pontiff himself, and by others of his successors, with a number of "stationary indulgences", he not only confirmed all the indulgences that had been previously granted in connection with the devotion, but, to show his love for the city and his concern for those who flocked to it "from wellnigh every province of the world", he granted "to all who with sorrow had confessed their sins" and should devoutly visit the "station" churches between Ash Wednesday and Easter Sunday, an indulgence of a year and forty days. To those who furthermore during that period got

Increased
indulgences
for the
"Stations",
1297.

¹ Potthast, nn. 25001-2. See *supra*, under Nicholas III., and the bulls of Boniface in *Bullar. Basilic. Vat.*, i, p. 226 ff.

² See their deed (*instrumentum*), ap. *B.B.V.*, i, p. 232 ff.

³ *Reg.*, n. 2813.

the Pope's blessing, he granted a further indulgence of a hundred days of the penance imposed upon them.¹

Petition for
more
indulgences.

But the crowds who came to Rome "from wellnigh every province of the world"² were not content with partial indulgences. They wanted something more. Those amongst us who have witnessed the advent of a new century know that, even now, it is accompanied by a very general feeling of excitement. Towards the close of the year 1299, and the beginning of the year 1300, quite a phenomenal number of pilgrims came to Rome. There was an impression that in Rome special *jubilee* indulgences were to be gained every fiftieth year—an idea that can be traced as far back as the beginning of the thirteenth century.³ Accordingly, when the pilgrims got to Rome at this time, they clamoured for this special indulgence. "Give us your blessing," they cried out to Boniface, "before we die. We have heard it from those of old that every hundredth year every Christian who shall visit the bodies of the Blessed Apostles Peter and Paul is freed from the stain of sin and from its punishment—*tam a culpa quam a pena.*"⁴

Among those who came to Rome for this indulgence, as we are assured by another contemporary, cardinal Stefaneschi, was a very old Savoyard. He was being carried on a litter by his sons to St. Peter's when he was

¹ Ep. of April 6, 1297, ap. Raynaldus, an. 1297, n. 70.

² G. Ventura († 1325), the author of the Chronicle of Asti, tells us that from the beginning of the year 1300, "*ab Oriente et ab Occidente tam viri, quam mulieres ex omni genere Christianorum in innumerabili quantitate veloces Romam pergentes dixerunt Bonifacio, etc.*" *Chron. Astense*, ap. R. I. SS., xi, p. 191, c. 26. G. V. was an eyewitness.

³ One of the versions of the Chronicle of Alberic "of the Three Fountains" has under the year 1208, "*dicatur quod annus iste quinquagesimus sive jubileus et remissionis in curia Romana sit celebratus.*" Ap. M. G. SS., xxiii, p. 889.

⁴ *Chron. Ast.*, l.c.

met by the Pope who, struck by his venerable appearance, inquired as to the reason of his coming to Rome. "I remember," said the pilgrim who professed to be one hundred and seven years old, "that, at the beginning of the last century, my father who was a labourer came to Rome, and dwelt here as long as his means lasted in order to gain the indulgence. He bade me not to forget to come at the beginning of the next century, if I should live so long, which he did not think I should do."¹

Interested by these requests and stories, Boniface ordered researches to be made as to their foundation. Although no authentic documents were brought to light, the inquiry showed that there was a widespread belief that some special indulgence was granted in Rome at the opening of a new century.² Boniface, accordingly, in the same spirit which had animated him when he encouraged the practice of the devotion of the Stations, issued the following bull (Feb. 22, 1300)³ :—

The first
Jubilee,
1300.

¹ Stefaneschi, c. 2, "De anno Jubileo," very indifferently printed, ap. La Bigne, *Bibliotheca Patrum*, vol. vi, p. 536, Paris, 1610, or in other eds. of the *Bib. P.*, e.g., that of Lyons, 1677, t. xxv, p. 936; or in Raynaldus, *Ann.*, 1300, n. 2 ff. Recourse for a good text must be had to the edition published by D. Quattrocchi in the periodical *Bessarione*, 1900, p. 299 ff. He used a MS. (*Arch. Basil. Vatic.*, G. 3) probably executed under the eyes of Stefaneschi himself. We have here used Thurston's translation; and, where the text is cited, we have used the quotations from Stefaneschi given in the *Civiltà Cattolica*, Rome, Jan. 6, 1900, as they are taken from the MS. *Cod. Vat. Lat.*, n. 4877 ff., 51 seq., and the edition of Quattrocchi.

² Cf. Villani, *Chron.*, viii, c. 36, who writes that: "it was said by many" that every hundred years from the birth of Christ, the Popes had granted great indulgences. "In iis multiplex fama vacillabat," adds Stefaneschi, c. 2. See also the *Annales Veronenses*, p. 459, ed. Cipolla.

³ On this same day, a papal scriptor, Magister Silvester de Adria, published a sort of commentary on the Pope's bull. It may be read in Rubeus, or best in G. Mercati's version in the clumsy verbose work entitled *Cronistoria dell' anno santo MCMXXV*, p. 1194 ff., Rome,

“Boniface, bishop, Servant of the Servants of God. For the perpetual remembrance of the matter. The trustworthy tradition of our ancestors affirms that great remissions and indulgences for sins are granted to those who visit in this city the venerable basilica of the Prince of the Apostles. Wherefore, We, who, according to the duty of our office, desire and ought to procure the salvation of each, holding all and each of these remissions and indulgences to be authentic, do by our apostolic authority confirm and approve the same. . . . In order that the Blessed Apostles Peter and Paul may be the more honoured as their basilicas in this city shall be the more devoutly frequented by the faithful, and that the faithful themselves may feel that they have been replenished by an abundance of spiritual favours in approaching their tombs, We, confiding in the mercy of Almighty God, in the merits and power of those Apostles, in the counsel of our brethren, and in the plenitude of the Apostolic Authority, grant to all who, being truly penitent, and confessing their sins, shall reverently visit these Basilicas in the present year 1300¹. . . and in each succeeding hundredth year, not only a full and copious, but the most full pardon of all their² sins. . . . Should anyone dare to impugn this rescript . . . let him know that he will incur the indignation of Almighty God and of the Blessed Apostles Peter and Paul. Given at St. Peter's, Rome, Feb. 22, 1300, in the sixth year of

1928. The MS. used by Mercati closes with three leonine verses which have generally been wrongly printed:—

“Annus centenus Rome semper est jubilenus.
Crimina laxantur, cui penitet ista donantur
Hoc declaravit Bonifacius et roboravit.”

¹ The Pope dates it from Christmas, 1299.

² He laid down that inhabitants of Rome had to visit the basilicas at least 30 times, strangers 15 times.

our pontificate.¹ The original bull was laid on the altar of St. Peter's, and a copy of it sent to the Basilica of St. Paul's.²

The "Jubilee" year, as Stefaneschi calls it, was now fairly inaugurated, and from the fact that, though writing only in February, Boniface declared that the year of indulgence had started on December 25, 1299, the day of our Lord's birth, and from the words of Villani³ that the Pope granted the indulgence "out of reverence for the Nativity of Christ", we can see that the leading idea in his mind was a special "centenary celebration" of our Saviour.

Historians have assigned to Boniface all manner of motives for this proclamation, in accordance with their own views of him. He wished to celebrate his victory over the Colonnas; he wanted money; he was desirous of impressing his power on Philip the Fair with whom he had begun to cross swords; he desired a favourable opportunity to urge a Crusade; or, in fine, he wanted to exalt the Church. As Boniface was anything but a man of narrow outlook, he cannot have been blind to the fact that, if the Christian world flocked to Rome, many other results would follow besides an increase of piety in the hearts of many. But such historical documents as are available⁴ prove clearly that Boniface's bull "Antiquorum" was not premeditated. It was an

¹ *Reg.*, n. 3875, or *Bullar. Rom.*, iv, p. 156 f., ed. Turin. After comparing it with the original, we have used Thurston's translation, p. 13 f.

² Stefaneschi, c. 3.

³ "A riverenza della Nativita di Cristo." *L.c.* Cf. Stefan., c. 8, "Dumque *centesimus colitur* Christi Jesu humanitatis memoracione dulcoramur." Cf. *ib.*, c. 12.

⁴ See the *Annales* of our King Edward, p. 449, *R. S.*, printed with Rishanger, which tell how Boniface "most devoutly" ordered all the crowds to be received who went to Rome in the "annus Jubelæus".

answer to the wishes of the faithful,¹ and was issued by him because he knew that a visit to Rome was good for the souls of men. Pier Paolo Vergerius, after a visit to Rome about a century later (1398), cried out : " Who, except the most abandoned of men, is not moved in his soul at the sight of so many sacred places, so many churches, so many relics, so many splendid religious monuments, especially when he remembers that the Popes have blessed visits to them with indulgences. Then, too, there are the Lenten stations so frequented by the Roman people and crowds of pilgrims. Further there are so many monks and nuns, not to mention " the majesty of the Supreme Pontiff with his power of binding and loosing souls ", the splendid assembly of the cardinals, the venerable authority of the other prelates, and the ceremonies of the Church which have been so ably and carefully thought out.²

Crowds flock
to Rome.

In any case the act of the Pope was greatly appreciated by the faithful, who flocked in crowds to the Eternal City. " Great numbers of Christians . . . women as well as men, made the said pilgrimage . . . both from

¹ Hence the author of our *Chronicle of Lanercost* breaks into leonine verse, to show that Boniface did but confirm an existing idea :—

" Annus centenus Romæ semper jubilæus ;
Crimina laxantur, cui poenitet ista donantur ;
Hoc declaravit Bonifacius et roboravit."

P. 194 ; Eng. trans., p. 170. From *The Travels of Montfaucon*, p. 398, it appears that these verses were to be found on the front of the Cathedral of Siena by one of the doors. So, too, the author of the *Annales S. Blasii*, ap. *M. G. SS.*, xxiv, p. 825, declares that the *apostolicus* merely confirmed an existing indulgence " que tunc fuit ".

² " Hec et hujusmodi talia, que multa in urbe sunt, ad excitandam animo religionem plurimum valent, ut taceam majestatem summi pontificis et datam sibi ligandi atque solvendi animas potestatem, splendorem cardinalium . . . ac preter omnia ceremonias optimis rationibus institutas." " De situ Rome," ap. *Eng. Hist. Rev.*, Oct., 1926, p. 573 ff.

far and near. It was the most marvellous thing that was ever seen, for throughout the year without break there were in Rome . . . two hundred thousand pilgrims, not counting those who were coming and going. All were suitably supplied and satisfied with provisions, horses as well as persons, and all was well ordered, and without tumult or strife ; and I can bear witness to this, for I (Villani) was present and saw it. And from the offerings of the pilgrims much treasure was added to the Church, and all the Romans were enriched by the trade.”¹ The assertions of Villani are borne out by other chroniclers,² but the order of which he speaks was not always in evidence. No doubt, at first, before it was realized what numbers intended to benefit by the spiritual advantages offered by the Pope, sufficient precautions were not taken, and in the great crushes it sometimes happened that some people fell and were trodden to death.³ But precautions were soon taken. Another gate was made in the walls near the Castle of S. Angelo (Monumentum Romuli).⁴ Among other remedial measures, as we learn from Dante, who was in Rome at the time, the bridge of St. Angelo was divided in the middle by a strong barrier. Speaking of moving swarms of lost souls, he sings :—

“ E’en thus the Romans, when the year returns
Of Jubilee, with better speed to rid
The thronging multitudes, their means devise
For such as pass the bridge ; that on one side
All front toward the castle, and approach
St. Peter’s fane, on the other towards the mount.”⁵

¹ *Chron.*, viii, 36, trans. Wicksteed.

² Cf. *Chron.* of Gilles le Muisit, p. 56, who was an eyewitness.

³ See the contemporary Ventura, *Chron. Ast.*, l.c.

⁴ Stefan., c. 5.

⁵ *Inf.*, xviii, 28 ff. Cf. the *Anon. Fiorentinus*, *Commento alla Divina Commedia*, ed. Fanfani, Bologna, 1866.

There is no doubt, however, that "the great indulgence of the jubilee"¹ drew unprecedented multitudes to Rome. The inhabitants of the great cities of northern Italy were astounded to see crowds daily passing through their streets on the way to the Eternal City. Dante, before or after his return from Rome, where he had been deeply touched by one:—

"Who haply from Croatia wends to see
Our Veronica; and the while 'tis shown,
Hangs over it with never sated gaze",²

was equally affected when, "wrapt in meditation," he beheld the "Romers" passing through the streets of Florence.³

City chroniclers cannot contain their wonder at the extraordinary spectacles they saw in their streets. The year they tell us was favourable; for "there was such peace and quiet throughout all Italy that all could journey to Rome in security", and it was a year of great fertility.⁴ Through the streets of Modena, its annalist saw crowds of people even from beyond the seas passing along, riding or driving, towards Rome, and in some cases he saw "many young men who in want of money were carrying their fathers or mothers on their backs".⁵ In

¹ So it is called by J. de Bazano, *Chron. Mutinense*, p. 53, ap. *R. I. SS.*, t. xv, pt. iv, new ed.

² *Par.*, xxxi, 104 ff. Cf. Villani, *l.c.*, who tells us that during this year of Jubilee: "for consolation of the Christian pilgrims, every Friday, and every solemn feast day was shown in St. Peter's the Veronica, the true image of Christ on the napkin." Known as the *Sudarium*, this "napkin" was at times exposed to the veneration of the faithful by Boniface himself. Cf. *Reg.*, n. 1529.

³ *Vita Nuova*. In Theodore Marten's Eng. trans., pp. 70–2, London, 1862.

⁴ *Annal. vet. Mutin.*, ap. *R. I. SS.*, xi, p. 75.

⁵ *Ib.* On the abundance of provisions in Rome itself, see the *Chronichetta di S. Andrea*, p. 30, ed. Carini, Rome, 1893. "Quanto populus magis multiplicabat, tanto alimoniarum copia redundabat.

amazement the Chronicler of Parma tells how from his district an "almost infinite" number, men and women, priests and laymen, monks and nuns, went to Rome. Thither, too, went from "Lombardy, France, Burgundy, Germany, and from every other province in Christendom—a countless multitude of barons, knights, and great ladies, and people of both sexes, of every state, rank, and condition". Every day at all hours one could see an army passing into the city from the Claudian Way and out on to it again. Especially was the chronicler impressed with the cavalcades of barons and noble ladies from France in groups of forty and fifty at a time. Every house on the said Way was crowded with visitors: "for the sound of the great indulgence went forth throughout all the world."¹ The Romans preposterously estimated that two million people visited Rome in the course of the year. From a contemporary inscription which Thurston, who quotes it, says was still to be seen in the seventeenth century in the Via della Fogna in Florence,² it appears that even Tartars journeyed to Rome for the indulgence. And if it is true that not many Kings came there during the year of Jubilee, Boniface is said to have proclaimed in consistory, with no little satisfaction, that no less than twelve solemn embassies from different rulers had been dispatched to him during its course.³

Et vilius alimenta venalia emebantur." At times there appears to have been a shortage of hay for the horses, and lodgings were dear. Cf. Ventura, *l.c.*, and Paolino Pieri, p. 66, whose narrative accords with the other chroniclers we have quoted.

¹ *Chron. Parm.*, pp. 80–1, new ed. Cf. *Chron. Astense, l.c.*; *Annal. Colmar.*, p. 38, and *Chron. Sanese*, ap. *R. I. SS.*, xv, p. 43. Those of us who were in Rome in 1925 can have no difficulty in imagining the scenes in Rome in 1300.

² *The H. year of J.*, p. 24. It is printed in Raynaldus, *Ann.*, 1300, n. 1, note.

³ St. Antoninus, *Chron.*, tit. xx, c. 7, p. 240.

Pecuniary
benefit to
Rome.

According to Ventura¹ the Pope received an enormous amount of money from the pilgrims, and he relates that two clerics were engaged "day and night" at the altar of St. Paul's, literally raking in the offerings of the people, and Ptolemy of Lucca estimated them to amount to a thousand pounds (Provinciales) a day.² However, from the vastly more authoritative narrative of cardinal Stefaneschi, we learn that the money offered was mostly the small coins of the poor, and that the sum of fifty thousand florins received in the two basilicas of St. Peter and St. Paul during the Jubilee year was not double that of the ordinary annual offerings, which he says amounted to over thirty thousand. The cardinal justly takes occasion from the fact that most of the money came from the poor, to upbraid the parsimony of the Kings of the earth; and he assures us that Boniface devoted the money received to the benefit of the two Basilicas themselves and of those who served them.³

Some
excluded
from the
benefit of the
Jubilee.

All Christians, however, were not suffered to benefit by the Jubilee. From a bull of Boniface, dated March 1, 1300, and cited by Stefaneschi,⁴ the Pope expressly excluded from the benefits of the Jubilee indulgence many who by their conduct "had rendered themselves unworthy of it". Such were "those false and impious Christians" who traded with the Saracens, Frederick of Sicily, and the inhabitants of that country who were hostile to the Roman Church, those who received the Colonnas, and generally all the public enemies of the Church.

Gratitude to
Boniface.

Seeing the good that had been effected by the Jubilee,

¹ *Chron. Ast.*, c. 26.

² *Annales*, p. 1303.

³ See the commentary of Tosti, note 2 E, p. 523 ff., on this obscure passage (c. 9) of Stefaneschi, which he quotes at length.

⁴ From him republished by Tosti, Doc. 2 D., p. 522 f.

there were souls who felt grateful to Boniface for having proclaimed it. Among these thoughtful men was a certain Master Bonajuto who expressed his thanks to the Pope in verses which were inserted in his work by the Annalist of Cesena.¹

Who, he asks, can ever give praise enough to Boniface, the Father and Glory of the World (Pater Orbis, decus Mundi), for being the cause, by his Jubilee, of so many graces from heaven? The poet prays, at first, that the Pope may live just as long as he may wish to live. Then, as he reflects that the cares of the world may make him wish to die soon, he alters his prayer. "May you live as long as the world needs you"!

If only because Giotto depicted Boniface proclaiming it, Boniface the Jubilee serves as a fitting introduction to a few words ^{a patron of art.} on that Pope's patronage of the fine arts. Knowing that it is by the arts especially that the mind of man is refined and his senses elevated, the Popes have ever blessed them as the dainty handmaids of religion. This attitude of the Heads of Christendom has always been highly appreciated by the great masters of the arts; and they have regarded it as "no more than reasonable" that those whose art and talents have adorned so many great churches should be suitably rewarded by them, and even that "their descendants should be decorated with the highest ecclesiastical dignities by the Holy Roman Church and her Pontiffs".² Up to his time there had been among the Popes perhaps no greater patron of the arts than Boniface VIII. His taste for the beautiful, his love of the magnificent, and his bounty, encouraged the local artists, and attracted those from a distance. The Cosmati,

¹ *Annales Cæsen.*, ap. *R. I. SS.*, xiv, p. 1119.

² So speaks Vasari, artist, biographer, and art critic, at the beginning of his *life* of Agnolo Gaddi.

and the then chief of the artistic world, Pietro Cavallini, worked under the inspiration of an enlightened fellow-countryman; Giotto and his pupils and friends were drawn to Rome by the fame of a powerful patron of the arts. To the Eternal City flocked painters and sculptors, architects and bell-founders, miniaturists and workers in gold and silver. If Cimabue (who in Florence, at any rate, was "thought to lord it over painting's field") did not come to Rome, his more famous pupil, Giotto, certainly did.¹ To it also came a number of Germans, pupils of Giovanni Pisani. Vasari declares that they served Boniface VIII. "in many works of sculpture executed for St. Peter's, and also in architecture when he made Cività-Castellana. They were, moreover, sent by that Pope to S. Maria at Orvieto, where they made a number of marble figures for the façade of the church, which were very tolerable for those times."² A much more famous sculptor who worked for Boniface was Arnolfo di Lapo, generally spoken of as "di Cambio".

Miniaturists.

For Boniface also worked the miniaturists Francis of Bologna and Oderisius of Gubbio, the friend of Giotto and Dante, the latter's Oderigi d'Agobbio whom he found in Purgatory:—

¹ "And now the cry is Giotto's." Dante, *Purg.*, xi, 93 ff. It has been denied, not that Giotto came to Rome, but that he was there as early as the days of Boniface. L. Venturi, "La data dell' attività romana di Giotto" in *L'Arte*, 1918, p. 229 ff., contends there is no foundation for the story that G. worked in Rome as early as even 1300. He puts the date of the Lateran fresco and the *Navicella* mosaic as late as 1320. But, especially by the discovery at Boville (formerly Bauco in the district of Frosinone) in the Church of St. Peter of fragments of the original (not restored) "Navicella" of Giotto, Van Marle, *La Peinture Romaine*, p. 250; Strasburg, 1921, stands for the date 1298. Illustrations of the "Bauco" fragments may be seen in Munoz, *Roma di Dante*, p. 88.

² See his *lives* of Niccola and G. Pisani, i, p. 46, Eng. trans.

“ ‘ Art thou not Oderigi ? art not thou
 Agobbio’s glory, glory of that art
 Which they of Paris call the limner’s skill ? ’
 Brother,’ said he, ‘ with tints that gayer smile,
 Bolognian Franco’s pencil lines the leaves.
 His all the honour now ; my light obscure.’ ”¹

Oderigi illuminated many books for Boniface’s library, of which we shall speak presently ; but, even by the days of Vasari, time had destroyed most of his work. Francis also “ did some very fair things for the Pope for the same library ” ; and Vasari assures us that he possessed specimens both of his work and that of Oderigi.²

Time has fortunately not destroyed all the illuminated books of this age, so that we can form some idea of their excellence. The Chapter of St. Peter’s has some volumes which Boniface’s kinsman, cardinal Stefaneschi, caused to be illuminated. One of these, the cardinal’s *Vita di S. Giorgio*, illuminated perhaps by Simone Martini of Giotto’s school, gives not only a most pleasing portrait of Stefaneschi himself,³ but another one showing Celestine V. giving to a cardinal the rule for his Order.⁴ This cardinal has sometimes been said to be Benedict Gaetani ; but it was no doubt cardinal James Colonna, the great patron of the Spirituals generally.

One of the most important artists who, as we have said, Giotto and
St. Peter’s. worked for Boniface, was Giotto. His fame had spread

¹ *Purg.*, xi, 76 ff. Cary.

² See his *life* of Giotto. Vasari here confuses Boniface VIII. with his successor, Benedict XI.

³ Reproduced in G. Cascioli, *La Naicella di Giotto*, p. 17, Rome, 1916, and better in Munoz, *Roma di Dante*, p. 19.

⁴ Reproduced in V. de Bartholomaeis in his ed. Buccio di Ranallo, *Cron. Aquilana*, p. 65, and in Munoz, p. 35. Crowe and Cavalcaselle, *Hist. of Painting*, iii, p. 168, no doubt wrongly, describe the miniature as representing St. Celestine presenting a copy of the book of the Gospels to B. VIII., then a cardinal-deacon.

to Rome ; and, as the Pope wished to decorate his beloved St. Peter's, he sent a messenger to Florence " to see what manner of man Giotto was, and to report on the quality of his work ". No tale in the story of art is better known than that which tells how Giotto would give the astonished messenger no more elaborate specimen of his powers than a perfect circle which he drew with a red pencil, pressing his arm to his side to make a compass of it. But, when the designs of the other artists along with Giotto's circle were shown to Boniface, he at once sent for Giotto, received him with great honour, and set him to work on St. Peter's. In the choir he painted five subjects from the life of our Lord, and in the nave various scenes from the Old and New Testaments. He also painted a colossal angel over the organ, and an altarpiece still to be seen in the sacristy of the canons of St. Peter.¹ Of the fresco work of Giotto in St. Peter's, none of the works enumerated has come down to us,² but, in a very " restored " state, his famous " Navicella " mosaic may still be seen in the portico of St. Peter's. This famous mosaic, originally made for the inner wall of the Paradise or atrium, showed Peter's bark riding the stormy waves in which Peter himself is prevented from sinking by the helping hand of the Saviour. The figure at the right-hand corner shows that the work was executed at the command of cardinal Stefaneschi. It was made in 1298, and cost two thousand two hundred

¹ Cf. Vasari in his *life* of Giotto, writing Benedict XI. (who was not Pope long enough to be a church decorator) for Boniface VIII. ; L. Ghiberti, *Secondo commentar.*, p. 34, ed. Frey : " Lavoro di mosayco la nave di san Piero in Roma, et di sua mano dipinse la capella ella (e la) tavola (the altarpiece) di san Piero in Roma." See also the other authorities cited by C. and C., *l.c.*, ii, p. 43.

² Nor anything of the " scenes from the lives of the martyred Popes in one of the rooms adjacent to San Pietro ". C. and C., *ib.*, p. 48.

and twenty florins.¹ For the work which Giotto did for him, Boniface, full of delight at its beauty, gave the artist six hundred gold ducats, and bestowed so many other favours on him that his generosity "became", says Vasari, "the talk of all Italy."

To be the more easily able to speak to the people or impart his blessing to them, Boniface, perhaps by the aid of Master Cassetta, who certainly did work for him at the Lateran and at Anagni,² constructed, at the west end of a certain portico, which led to the palace from the basilica, a marble pulpit (or *mœnianum*). This "benediction" loggia, projecting beyond the *sala concilii*, consisted of a baldachino supported by four marble columns, and was decorated on the outside with the arms of the Pope, the processional umbrella, and other emblems, and inside with frescoes which Panvinio assigned to Cimabue,³ but which, according to Rasponi,⁴ many in his time assigned to Giotto, and which since then have almost universally been ascribed to him. An inscription set

Boniface's
pulpit.

¹ C. and C., *ib.*, p. 44. The history of this mosaic and its translations is fully told by G. Cascioli, *La Navicella di Giotto*, Rome, 1916.

² See the fragment of the expenses of Boniface cited above: "Magistro Cassette pro operibus factis in Laterano cccxc lib., xiv sol., et vii den. prov." P. 364. Cf. p. 365. "Magistris Mathie clerico Camere, Cassette et Nicolao de Pileo pro op. fact. Anagnie, pro domibus dñi. et familie mccccxiii lib., xvi sol., vii den. prov." Theiner, *Cod. Dip.*, i. Müntz, *Hist. des arts à Rome*, p. 18, cites from Panvinio, *De præcipuis Romæ basilicis*, p. 113, Rome, 1570, an obscure inscription which seems to refer to the work of Boniface for the Lateran basilica. We here give a line or two:—

"Tandem convaluit (the Basilica), rusticam relinquendo catervam :
Papa Bonifacius veniens octavus in eam,
Auxit, posuit de multis nobile germen." Etc.

³ *L.c.*, p. 182; Müntz, p. 19 ff.

⁴ *De basilic Lat.*, p. 327, Rome, 1656. In Rasponi's plan the pulpit, or podium as he calls it, of Boniface is clearly marked projecting beyond the Aula Concilii. On the pulpit see also O. Sirén, *Giotto and some of his followers*, Cambridge, 1917, p. 22.

forth that the lord Pope Boniface made the whole work in the year 1300. "Dominus Bonifacius Papa octavus totum opus præsentis thalami . . . Anno Domini millesimo trecentesimo."

Giotto's
picture of
Boniface.

Of the frescoes which dealt with the baptism of Constantine, the building of the Lateran basilica, and the proclamation of the Jubilee indulgence, only a fragment of the last-named has survived the devastations of time. It is now to be found in the basilica of St. John Lateran under glass attached to one of the pilasters on the right-hand side of the nave near the main doors.¹ This fragment shows Boniface under the canopy and behind a balustrade which is ornamented by two shields bearing his arms, and covered with a rich carpet. Boniface, clad in a cope and wearing a tiara terminating in a little cross and with one crown, is with hand upraised proclaiming the Jubilee indulgence, while on his left a cleric is holding the bull on which are the words: "Bonifacius Ep. Servus Servorum Dei. Ad perpetuam rei memoriam." But a drawing of the original fresco found in the Ambrosian library at Milan,² shows that the Pope was surrounded by cardinals, bishops, and other clerics, and by the pontifical guard and attendants bearing the ceremonial umbrella. Beneath the Pontiff were the faithful, men and women, on horseback and on foot, listening to the proclamation.³

¹ The following inscription shows that it was put into its present position by the Gaetani family. "Imago iconica B. VIII. P. M. jubelæum primum in annum MCCC indicentis pictura Giotti æqualis eorum temporum quam e veteri podio in claustra inde in templum translatam gens Gaietana ne avitum monumentum vetustate deleteretur anno MDCCCLXXXVI crystallo obtegendam curavit."

² A reproduction of it is given by Müntz at the end of the paper just quoted, and by Muñoz, *l.c.*, p. 14.

³ Speaking of this delineation of Boniface, Leader Scot, *The Renaissance of Art in Italy*, p. 63, following Kugler, calls it: "a true

It has been said by some authors that Giotto also worked in Naples, and there, too, in the church of S. Maria l'Incoronata, left portraits of Boniface VIII. It cannot, however, now be positively asserted that the frescoes in that church are from the hands of Giotto, nor even that the Pope represented in a fresco depicting the giving of the Sacrament of Holy Order is meant for Boniface VIII. Still, the general opinion seems to be that the fresco represents that pontiff conferring the Sacrament on St. Louis of Anjou.¹ The ascription seems reasonable, and the pleasing regular features of the pontiff of the fresco² may be thought to bear some resemblance to those of the recumbent figure of Boniface on his tomb. But the point is far from certain.³

Portrait
of B. at
Naples ?

One of the very interesting churches in Rome, if only because it is the best example of a Gothic church in the city, is that of S. Maria sopra Minerva. It was Boniface who very materially helped its completion. He not only gave two thousand pounds *tournois* himself in order to push on the building (Jan. 18, 1295), but he urged the

S. Maria and
S. Lorenzo.

portrait, cunning, facetious, and yet carrying a certain dignity." Here again we see the "fox" story influencing even artistic vision! If Giotto has put an expression of cunning into his face of Boniface, he put something which was not naturally there. Boniface's "pulpit" shown on the picture of the Lateran in Ciampini, *De Sacris Ædif.*, pl. v, existed till the reconstruction of the Lat. palace by Sixtus V. Ciampini's picture, and still more clearly the Vatican fresco (beautifully reproduced in Lauer, *Le Palais de Latran*, pl. xxix-xxx) prove that the top of the "pulpit" was a Gothic canopy such as was ordinarily made at the time by the Roman marmorarii, and not a flat-topped rectangular baldachino as shown in the Ambrosian sketch.

¹ So C. and C., ii, p. 98; Hare, *Cities of S. Italy*, p. 93; Murray, *South Italy*, i, p. 47.

² See fig. 525 of A. Venturi, *La pittura del trecento*, p. 644.

³ Alvé, *Les peintures de Giotto de l'église de l'Incoronata*, Berlin, 1843, thinks that the features of the Pope of the fresco are more like those of Clement V. Cf. Venturi, *l.c.*, p. 648 f.

faithful to contribute to it.¹ He also rebuilt the ancient church of S. Lawrence in Panisperna (1300).²

The chapel
and tomb of
Boniface.

We do not know the architect who reconstructed S. Lawrence for Boniface, but there is every reason to believe that the architect and sculptor who made for him an altar in the chapel of Boniface IV. in St. Peter's, and the tomb in which he was buried, was the famous Tuscan, Arnolfo di Cambio. There is extant a letter of the Pope himself to the Chapter of St. Peter's, in which, besides observing that his devotion to their basilica is ever on the increase, he incidentally notes that he intended to be buried therein, and had erected in it a dignified chapel and altar in honour of the blessed confessor, Boniface (IV.).³ From a document of the said Chapter in connection with this letter of the Pope,⁴ we further learn that he had also caused to be made by the side of the chapel a very stately tomb for himself. The chapel, rather reconstructed than originally built by the Pope, was situated in the south-east corner of the nave, and was, in the style of the time, covered with a Gothic canopy. Above the altar, so placed that it could be seen by the priest when saying Mass, was the tomb of Boniface, adorned with his arms and with his recumbent effigy on the top of it. The architect of the chapel was Arnulfo, for his name was engraved on it,⁵ and no doubt, too, he was the sculptor of the tomb. Above the tomb again was a mosaic, the work, says Grimaldi, of Jacobus Torriti, who has earned

¹ J. J. Berthier, *L'église de la Minervi*, p. 9.

² Armellini, *Le chiese di Roma*, p. 199, and Müntz, *l.c.*, p. 24.

³ Ep. of Apr. 27, 1300, ap. *Bullar. Basil. Vat.*, i, p. 226.

⁴ Dated Jan. 14, 1301, ap. *ib.*, p. 233.

⁵ See an important passage in an inedited MS. of Grimaldi (*Cod. Vat. Barberini*, xxxiv, n. 56, or *Barb. Lat.*, n. 2733, f. 1 v.) published by A. L. Frothingham, jun., ap. *American Journal of Archæology*, vol. i, 1885, p. 51, from which our quotations are taken. "Sacelli præfati architectus fuit Arnulphus cujus nomen inibi incisum erat."

such great fame from his mosaics in the apses of St. Mary Major's and St. John Lateran. The mosaic, now unfortunately no more, showed our Lady and her Child, with SS. Peter and Paul, of whom the former was presenting to the Blessed Virgin Pope Boniface, who was represented on his knees before her.¹ Fortunately the tomb, and a bust of the Pope which probably also was made for this chapel, may both still be seen in the crypt of St. Peter's; and he who gazes on them will not readily believe all that has been written of his overbearing and cruel character.²

Boniface, who did so much in different ways to enhance the dignity and beauty of the basilica of St. Peter's, contributed likewise to the preservation of its rights. Long before his time there had been in connection with it, as with other churches and persons, a number of judges appointed to deal summarily with flagrant cases. These specially delegated judges, the successors of the old *defensores*, were named in accordance with fixed rules, and were first called "conservatores" by Innocent IV. In the fourteenth century at any rate, they were appointed for life, and were specially commissioned by Pope John XXII. to protect the property of the basilica which, especially during the Avignon period, was much encroached upon. At first only men of no particular position were named *conservatores*, but as this fact lessened their authority when dealing with men of high rank, Alexander IV., after inculcating their respectful treatment

Conservatores of
St. Peter's.

¹ See the drawing of the chapel, tomb, and mosaic, ap. Ciampini, *De S. Ædif.*, plate xx. "Imaginem vero Deiparæ, etc. . . . pinxit vermiculato opere Jacobus Torriti ut in libro picturarum in hac basilicæ demolitione conficiendo clarius videre licet." See also Cerrati in his notes to *Alpharani de basil. Vat.*, p. 65 f. Muñoz, *l.c.*, pp. 48-9, gives Grimaldi's copies of the chapel and tomb of Boniface.

² See the description of the tomb given by the chronicler, Sigfrid de Balnhusin, ap. *M. G. SS.*, xxv, p. 712.

of bishops and renewing their powers, finally decreed (March 23, 1256),¹ that only bishops, abbots, and canons of cathedrals could be *conservatores*. Boniface, besides confirming the decree, added a number of regulations of his own concerning these "*conservatores*, who were at times granted by the Apostolic See to protect certain people from open injury or molestation". They were only to be allowed to delegate their authority when their letters of appointment had made special mention of this power; and their authority, limited to the city or diocese to which they were attached, was to cease on the death of him who had granted it.²

What is known to its people as the palace of Boniface VIII. at Anagni need not claim our attention, as the researches of Marchetti-Longhi have shown that Boniface did nothing to that part of it, now in the monastery of the Cistercians, which was largely the work of Pope Gregory IX., and that what was really his palace (of which the solid arcading below the palace of the Marquis Traietto is a remnant) was bought by him when cardinal from Conrad of Sgurgola.³

Statues and
portraits of
Boniface
everywhere.

The statues of himself ordered by Boniface were very far from being the only ones of him made during his lifetime. His fine presence and features appealed to artists,

¹ *Reg.*, nn. 1325, 1328. He decreed at the same time that only kings and queens in their own territories should have *conservatores* and he abolished all others. The bull is given in full ap. *Bullar. Rom.*, iii, p. 632, ed. Torino.

² For these and other regulations of his, see his letter of Apr. 8, 1295, ap. *Bullar. R.*, iv, p. 128 f., and see also A. Guerra, *Pontif. constitutionum epitome*, iii, p. 68, "De conservatoribus ecclesiarum et monasteriorum," and A. de Bouard, "Les conservatores et judices de la basilique de S. Pierre à Rome," ap. *Mélanges d'archéol.*, t. xxx (1910), p. 321 ff., with documents.

³ Cf. G. Marchetti-Longhi, "Il palazzo di Bonifacio VIII. in Anagni," ap. *Archivio Rom. di storia patria*, 1920, p. 379 ff.

and the advantages he had conferred on communities made men anxious to have his likeness before them. "To the glory of the Pope—ad magnificentiam dicti Pape," Orvieto put up two marble statues to him (1297), one at the great gate (porta major), and the other at the postern gate (porta posterula).¹ Both these statues still exist, but they are so damaged by exposure to the air that they are not worth looking at. In somewhat better condition is the indifferent enthroned figure of the Pontiff under a niche on the outside of the cathedral of Anagni, which Lord Balcarres boldly calls a "magnificent portrait".² A really imposing seated figure of Boniface, said by Vasari to have been the work of Andrea Pisano, is now to be seen in the cathedral of Florence. It once adorned its façade, was taken down in 1586, and by the middle of the eighteenth century was to be seen in the Giardino Riccardi in the Via Valfonda.³

The Museo Civico at Bologna possesses a full standing statue of Boniface made by the goldsmith Manno out of thin repoussé plates of bronze, which is much more of a curiosity than a portrait. An inscription sets forth that the people of Bologna erected it to Boniface on account of the striking favours he had bestowed upon them (1301). Finally, from the Register of Boniface⁴ we learn that there was a silver gilt statue of him in the cathedral at Amiens, but of which no trace seems to remain. We have made no mention so far of the kneeling figure of a mediaeval

¹ See the chronicle of Orvieto printed by F. Montemarti (p. 221) as an appendix to his *Cronaca inedita d'Orvieto* (1333-1400), Torino, 1846. Cf. G. Sommer, *Die Anklage der Idolatrie gegen P. Bonifaz VIII.*, a thesis for the doctorate, Freiburg-i-Br., 1920.

² *The Evolution of Italian Sculpture*, p. 99, n., London, 1909. Cf. p. 88. In any case the statue does not date from the days of Boniface.

³ Cf. Gerspach, "La statue de B. VIII. au dome de Florence" in *Rev. de l'art chrétien*, 1895.

⁴ N. 4301.

Pope in St. John Lateran's which has been assigned to various Pontiffs, to Innocent IV., Boniface IX., etc. Some critics see in it a figure of Boniface VIII. From the plate in his *life* by Rubæus,¹ it is clear that such was the belief before his time, and from a comparison between it and the figure in Florence cathedral, it might be argued that it does belong to Boniface VIII.²

The painters were not behind the sculptors in producing portraits of Boniface. Giotto, who is credited by Vasari with having revived the art of making good portraits of living people, painted, as we have seen, at least one portrait of Boniface. Whether we are to believe Vasari and regard Simone Martini as Giotto's pupil, or follow Crowe and Cavalcaselle and suppose he was not, we cannot well refuse to believe the former, when, on appeal to his book of sketches, he declares that Simone "was very fond of drawing from life". No doubt then he had drawn the portrait of Boniface; and when later, in the church of San Lorenzo Maggiore in Naples, he painted a fresco of the consecration of St. Louis of Anjou by that Pope, he was able to depict a likeness of him.³ Ambrogio Lorenzetti, who was not without skill as a portrait painter, has also depicted the same lowly Franciscan saint on his knees before Boniface, and has also presumably attempted a portrait of the Pope.⁴

¹ P. 90.

² For ourselves, as we have said before, we believe it to be a statue of Boniface IX. Forming part of the ornamentation of a little "Cosmati" tabernacle in S. Clemente there is a little figure of a Pope on his knees by the side of our Lady. The figure is believed to be that of Boniface. Cf. Muñoz, *Roma di Dante*, p. 47. See also on these statues of the Pope, C. Ricci, *Santi ed Artisti*, p. 30 ff., and Müntz, *l.c.*, p. 12 f.

³ See Venturi, *l.c.*, and an illustration of the consecration, p. 594.

⁴ See an illustration of this picture which is in Siena, ap. Venturi, *l.c.*, p. 699.

Whatever the historical value of some of these assertions may be, the multiplication of statues and pictures of Boniface gave his French opponents some sort of a handle against him. It gave them, in their anxiety to overwhelm him with accusations, an opening to prefer the ridiculous charge of encouraging idolatry against him. As an eighth indictment against him, they declared that he caused silver images of himself to be put up in the churches to lead men into idolatry. For the same purpose, he had marble statues of himself put up at the gates of cities, and in such other places as the idols of the ancients used to be. He is said also to have declared that, when a Pope was elected, statues of him should be set up to which all princes and people should do reverence.¹ The only good purpose to be served by mentioning these utterly baseless charges brought against Boniface, is to put in its true light the malicious astuteness of his bitter enemies. They knew that the multitude would conclude that, if a sufficient number of dreadful things were said against a man, he must be wicked. The reflection of Müntz on Boniface's patronage of art is much more just: "Boniface's spirit of magnificence brought too much profit to art, to let us dream, like the agents of Philip the Fair, of turning it into an accusation against the proud representative of the old family of the Gaetani. Let us rather admire the zeal with which this old man occupied himself with everywhere raising monuments of his pomp and glory, or rather, in the words of his biographer Amalricus, 'in extending his power and papal magnificence'." ²

It is also recorded of Boniface that he employed the Bells and Books.

¹ Dupuy, *Hist. du diff.*, p. 331. "Fecit imagines suas argenteas erigi in ecclesias, per hoc homines ad idolatrando inducens." Cf. p. 103, etc.

² *L.c.*, p. 14. M., we may note, was a Jew.

Tuscan bell-founders, "Andreottus and Johannes condam Guidocti, Pisani", to make a bell for the cathedral of Anagni. They left their names in Gothic characters, and the date, 1295, upon it—all in "superb relief".¹ In 1303 we read that a fire destroyed the campanile of Leo IV. at St. Peter's, along with its bells. Among those destroyed was one which had been erected by Gregory IX. in 1231, and which, according to the *Liber Pontificalis*, excelled all the other bells in the city in size, and in the quality of its tone. They were, says Bonanni, on the authority of the *Liber Benefactorum* of the Vatican basilica, immediately replaced through the munificence of Boniface by finer ones.²

We have seen that Boniface caused "many books" to be illuminated "for the palace library".³ The story of this library which formed part of the *Thesaurus* of the Pope and the Roman Church, and which followed the Pontiff whenever he left Rome, has been written by father, now cardinal, Ehrle.⁴ His work continues that of De Rossi on the Vatican library, and contains the story of the library of Boniface, and that of the Avignon Popes. At this period the *Thesaurus*, of which the records, at least as far as its library section are concerned, now for the first time become continuous, was

¹ See X. Barbier de Montault, *La cathédrale d'Anagni*, p. 18, Paris, 1858. The inscription sets forth that the bell was erected to the honour of God, our Lady, and the martyrs Magnus and Secundinus; that Boniface ordered the work to be done; and that the "Pisani me fecerunt".

² *Temp. Vaticani hist.*, p. 149, ed. 1696. Cf. Cancellieri, *De Secretariis*, iii, p. 1356, and Muñoz, *Roma di D.*, pp. 334-5, for illustrations of the Anagni bell. The part of the *Liber B.* cited by Bonanni has been published, ap. *Archivio R. di S. P.*, 1883, p. 13.

³ See Vasari's *life of Giotto*.

⁴ *Historia bibliothecæ Rom. Pont. tum Bonifatianæ tum Avenionensis*, Rome, 1890. Cf. I. Carini, *La biblioteca vaticana*, pp. 23-5, Rome, 1893.

under a cardinal-camerarius, an ordinary chamberlain (camerarius), and a treasurer. The last-named office was, as we have seen, held during part of the pontificate of Boniface by Theoderic of Orvieto, afterwards bishop of Civitas Papalis.

As the *Thesaurus* was, of course, with Boniface when his palace was sacked by Nogaret and his gang,¹ no doubt his library also suffered. At any rate, his successor transported it, or what was left of it, along with what was left of the *Thesaurus*, to Perugia. When Clement V. ordered the library to be brought to Avignon (1311), a number of the books which had reached Lucca on their way thither were destroyed in a popular disturbance (1314). The rest of them were taken for safety to the church of St. Francis at Assisi, whence it appears that the Popes did not easily recover them, as the collection of Boniface has practically disappeared. Before the books left Perugia, a catalogue of them, reprinted by Ehrle,² was made by various chaplains and treasurers of Clement (1311); and from it we can see that the library of Boniface was second only to those of Canterbury and the Sorbonne. From the six hundred and forty-five entries we see further that, besides missals, pontificales, breviaries, "secundum usum curie romanæ," books of the Gospels, and Bibles, "beautifully illuminated," and other church books, sometimes stamped with the arms of Boniface, there were some books of history,³ philosophy,⁴ theology, law,

¹ If we compare the inventory of the *Thesaurus* made by order of Clement V. (ap. *Reg. Clement V.*, vol. viii, p. 369 ff.) with that made in 1295, we see that a great part of the *Thesaurus* of Boniface was either not stolen or was recovered.

² *L.c.*, p. 24 ff. "De bonis dicti thesauri fecimus et fieri fecimus inventarium," p. 26.

³ E.g., a little book, well written: "de promotione et commendatione d. Bonifatii," which Ehrle thinks may be Stefaneschi's book, p. 31.

⁴ Several of these by "bro. Thos. of Aquino".

civil and canon,¹ controversy,² medicine, patrology, *dictamina*, sermons, chronology, and music, and even an old romance or two. One of these last is the romance of our King Arthur. Then there were a few, very few, classical authors, and a number of books in Greek, on philosophy, science, medicine, etc.,³ and some books dedicated to Boniface.⁴ Occasionally a book is marked as of little or no value, or attention is drawn to the fact that a book is very old.⁵ Besides all these which may be described as ordinary library books, there were a number of volumes which would ordinarily be found in special offices or archives, such for instance as a volume which is described as a *process* (inquisitio) against those who rejoiced in the death of Pope Boniface.⁶ Then there were a number of account books, one giving all the particulars of the fiefs, etc., of the county of Venaissin, and the revenues therefrom.⁷ Others gave the income and expenditure of the Keeper of the Wardrobe of Nicholas IV.,⁸ and the income and expenditure of the Roman Church during the reigns of Nicholas III., Martin IV., Honorius IV., and Nicholas IV.⁹

Some documents on papyrus were still in the library.¹⁰ One was an inventory made under Boniface VIII. (1295), whilst "Cardarello of Narni, and Master Gregory of

¹ E.g., "Constitutiones imperatoris Fred. II." Of course also Boniface's addition to the Canon Law, and commentaries thereon.

² On the questions of the day, as to whether a Pope could resign, as to the rights of the mendicant Orders, as to the position of the *Spirituals*, etc.

³ Cf. especially, pp. 96-8.

⁴ Cf. pp. 107-8.

⁵ Cf. n. 499. It is the register of John VIII.

⁶ N. 78. Cf. n. 367, a nuncio's report.

⁷ N. 359.

⁸ N. 362.

⁹ N. 468. Cf. 478, 582.

¹⁰ "Unum quaternum de bombice sive papiro antiquo, in quo est inventarium quarundam rerum auri et argenti et paramentorum." N. 254.

Alatri" were treasurers.¹ The last entry does not deal with a single volume, but speaks of three chests containing various documents on papyrus or parchment.

The authors of the catalogue also state that they had not examined certain coffers of Popes Boniface VIII. and Benedict XI., as they had been sealed up by three cardinals. Nor, "from reverence," had they catalogued the relics, nor yet, "from want of time," the documents usually under the charge of the lord chamberlain,² as they consisted of the registers of many Popes, of quantities of official documents, account books, legal cases, etc. There were also in the same chamber, some old armour, and various utensils of little value which were also not entered in the catalogue. However, a number of miscellaneous articles found in the *treasury* were catalogued, such, for instance, as some pieces of money, a number of precious stones, vases of crystal, vestments, etc., which were usually placed in other departments of the treasury.

Of the precious articles stored up in these different departments, Boniface caused a number of inventories to be made, of which one or two have survived.³ They serve to show not only the care taken by Boniface of the

Inventories
of precious
things.

¹ N. 488. Cf. nn. 472, 496, and 630, which was an inventory of the treasury also of the year 1295. These two inventories, one on papyrus and one on parchment, were in the *Thesaurus* in 1311. Cf. the inventory of that year in *Regist. Clem. V.*, vol. viii, pp. 500 and 510.

² P. 102. "Item non scripsimus ea quæ sunt in camera quam consuevit tenere d. camerarius."

³ In addition to that of Molinier cited above, there are (1) a very short one referring to the basilica of St. Peter, published by Müntz and Frothingham, "Il tesoro di S. Pietro in Vaticano dal XIII. al XV. secolo," ap. *Archivio Rom. di storia patria*, vol. vi, 1883, pp. 11-13, or ap. Barbier de Montault, *Œuvres complètes*, ii, p. 290 ff. (2) An inventory of the gifts of Boniface to the cathedral of Anagni, ap. B. de M. in the *Annales archéologiques*, vol. xviii, p. 18 ff., or ap. Boldetti, *Osservazioni sopra i Cimiteri*, p. 304 f., Rome, 1720. (3) An inventory "thesauri R. ecclesiæ" of the days of Boniface VIII. and Benedict XI.,

property of the Holy See, but also his patronage of the small and delicate fine arts of the gold and silversmith, the needle-worker, the enameller, and the like. From the inventories which have come down to us, it is clear that many of the things in the *Treasury* were merely ornaments forming a sort of museum, but the greater part of its contents appear to consist of articles which were used from time to time, such as sacred vestments, altar linen and ornaments, pontifical jewellery, etc. A large proportion of the valuables were gifts, and showed their origin by the arms impressed upon them. Thus very many bore arms of the Kings of England, of France, of Aragon, of Navarre and France, of the duke of Burgundy, of the Orsini and Sabelli, or of Boniface himself or of his family, the Gaetani. Of the sacred vestments or altar linen the largest proportion would seem to have been made in England,¹ and in many cases were embroidered with figures of our Lord or His Saints.² Among other interesting items in the *thesaurus* were Limoges enamels, the throne of the Emperor Frederic II.,³ golden roses, relics of the true Cross, rings, some of which were for use and some of which were merely curios,⁴ crowns and mitres,

made in 1304, which Molinier believed to be inedited, but which apparently had been edited by P. Galletti, *Del vestarario della S. R. chiesa*, Rome, 1758, p. 58 ff.

¹ Such phrases as "cum frixio anglicano"; "cum aurifrixio anglicano"; "de opere anglicano," etc., are of constant occurrence.

² No. 916 (of Molinier's inventory, which registers 1657 items). "Duas planetas laboratas de opere anglicano ad diversas historias super xamito albo." Cf. n. 928, "Tunica de diaspro albo ad aves in rotis cum frixio a pede, manibus, et spatulis de Anglia ornata." Some of the gifts of Boniface were of things which he had before he became Pope. Cf. Mol., n. 1534: "Multa paramenta que idem dominus habuerat precardinalatus."

³ Mol., n. 341, with the note thereto.

⁴ *Ib.*, n. 583, which is described as having a "rubinum oblungum", and as used by the Pope. Another, n. 619, with a figure of Hercules engraved on it, we may regard as a curio.

and hangings of various kinds. At times a note is appended to an article of value which lets us see that the custody of such treasures caused no little anxiety to their guardians. After describing a *dorsale* which was ornamented with a number of precious stones, the catalogue adds that, in the pontificate of Martin, one Christmas Day at Orvieto, a sapphire fell away from it, and, though diligent search was made for it, it could not be found.¹ Another elaborately embroidered *dorsale* commemorated the union of the Greeks under Gregory X. That pontiff was represented as holding the Emperor Michael Palæologus by the hand, and presenting him, as reconciled, to St. Peter.²

These inventories are also useful for letting us see where fine or curious materials came from. There is very frequent mention in them of cloth from the Eastern Empire, Tartary, Spain, Venice, or Lucca, and even of *imperial* cloth of which remains still exist in some museums.³ Linen, plain or worked, is often said to be "of Lombard" or "of German work", and boxes to be of English or Cyprus work.

When we look at the list of the gifts which, from time to time, Boniface gave to Anagni cathedral, the same kind of splendid objects meet the eye. One of them was a *fronsale*, embroidered with the story of St. Thomas à Becket of Canterbury, which we know made so great an appeal to the whole Christian world. With Boldetti, the editor of this inventory, it will suffice to add here that

¹ N. 810.

² N. 811.

³ N. 959, which mentions a dalmatic "*de panno imperiali de Romania ad aquilas magnas cum duobus capitibus*". We must pass over the lists of ornamental knives, spoons, combs, fans (*flabella*), etc., and of bibles presented to the *thesaurus* by Boniface; but may note the gold cross begun by Nicholas IV., and completed by Boniface. Mol., n. 1656. See B. de Montault's commentary on Molinier's inventory.

many of the items enumerated therein are still to be seen at Anagni.

Finally, from the inventory published by Galletti, we may signalize: "two letters sealed with the seal of Albert, King of Germany, on the recognition of the subjection of the Empire to the Roman Church, and on certain promises made by him to it."¹ The same inventory supplies us with a few summaries, as, for instance, that in the *thesaurus* of Boniface and Benedict XI. there were one hundred and fifteen rings.²

The vestments with which Boniface was clothed in death.

When the original basilica of St. Peter was being demolished, the tombs of the Popes in it were opened with a view to their bodies being transferred elsewhere. Of the opening of the coffin of Boniface (1605), the famous antiquarian, canon Grimaldi, who was present at it, has left us a most minute account which has been published by Dionysius.³ From the canon's story we learn not only that the body of Boniface was found intact and incorrupt, but, what concerns us at the moment, that loving hands had clothed it in beautiful vestments like unto those which we know from his inventories he had given with such prodigality to St. Peter's. The alb which had been put on the body, and which reached to the feet, was adorned on the breast with an apparel (*fimbria*), on which was worked a representation of the Annunciation. The narrow stole of six and three-quarter palms⁴ in length was made of black silk brocaded in silver in Turkish style; the girdle was of red and green silk beautifully woven, and the narrow

¹ P. 68. "Item due litere sigillate sigillo Alberti, regis Alemannie super recognitione subjectionis imperii ab ecclesia Romana, etc."

² P. 75.

³ *Vatic. Basil. cryptarum mon.*, p. 128 ff.

⁴ A Roman palmus or lesser palm was about 3 inches, and the palma or greater palm a little over 8½ inches. In her *Seven Centuries of Lace*, London, 1908, Mrs. H. Pollen treats of a lace alb that belonged to Boniface.

maniple was worked in the style known as "ad undas" with gold and silver threads on black and purple silk. The sandals or shoes were of black silk pointed and cusped in the Gothic style, and worked with small flowers in gold. They were only a palm and a half long, whence we may conclude that the feet were small. The tunic with narrow sleeves was of black silk, furnished with apparels in front and behind, which, on a purple ground, were embroidered with lions in gold and silk. The dalmatic, with wide sleeves, was still more elaborate in its embroidered apparels, which, on a black ground, showed roses and dogs rampant worked in gleaming gold in the Turkish or Persian fashion. The buskins (leggings) were of the black silk known as Ormisenum. The chasuble (or planeta) was wide, such as "was worn by the ancients", was of black silk, and was "wonderfully and solidly" embroidered in gold on a purple background in Moorish style. The fannon round the neck and over the shoulders was of pure fine white silk. The pallium, adds Grimaldi, because made of wool, had for the most part perished, but the pins of gold set with sapphires which fastened it, and a few parts of it, such as its black silk crosses, were still to be seen. The white silk gloves ornamented with pearls were also intact. Over the right-hand glove was a most beautiful gold ring set with a large sapphire. A low white mitre of damasin completed the costume with which the body of Boniface VIII. was found clothed.¹

Even if nothing is said of the works of art in which Boniface had a share in cities outside Rome, such as Anagni and Orvieto,² it will probably be recognized

¹ Mons. C. Gaetani, *Bonif. VIII.*, p. 32, gives an Italian version of the procès.

² Cf. L. Fumi, *Cod. dip. d'Orvieto*, p. 398; his "Il palazzo Soliano o de' Papi in Orvieto", in *L'Arte*, 1896, p. 213 ff., and his *Orvieto*,

by such as have read the last few pages that Pope Boniface VIII. was a munificent patron of every branch of the fine arts. His great soul was ever ready to help forward whatever tended to uplift those—and they were all on the face of the earth—of whom he felt himself the responsible head.

Città di Castello, 1891. In the last-mentioned book, Fumi recalls with affection the "imponente figura" of Boniface, "papa troppo vituperato, forse perchè troppo antifrancese, a Pope too much maligned, perhaps because he was too much anti-French," p. 135. He speaks there, too, of the "palazzo Soliano . . . da lui e per lui eretta presso al duomo".

CHAPTER VI.

POPE BONIFACE AND THE COLONNAS.

Sources and Modern Works.—As the following works all publish a number of documents they can be classed as both *Sources* and books on the sources. P. A. Petrini, *Memorie Prenestine*, Roma, 1795; H. Denifle, "Die Denkschriften der Colonna gegen Bonifaz VIII. und der Cardinale gegen die Colonna," ap. *Archiv für Literatur und Kirchengeschichte des Mittelalters*, vol. v, 1889, p. 493 ff.; and L. Mohler, *Die Kardinäle Jakob und Peter Colonna*, Paderborn, 1914. H. V. Sauerland, in the *Archivio R. Soc. Rom. di storia pat.*, vol. xvi (1893), pp. 233-5, published a "very brief account" of the appeal of the two Colonna cardinals to Clement V. to be reinstated in their dignities and properties. But, as it contains little else but positive assertions on the one side and flat denials on the other, the document is not of great value. However, in one case, the compiler does say that he conceived the Colonnas had the better of the argument. Another item states that Boniface had given property to his brother Loffred before he became Pope, so that there could be no question as to that having belonged to the Roman Church. *Kardinal Napoleon Orsini*, by Alb. Huyskens, is only a dissertation carrying the cardinal's life to the election of Clement V., Marburg, 1902, but since then Dr. C. A. Willemsen has published, 1927, Berlin, a full study on *Kard. Nap. O.* (1263-1342), with an appendix of eight documents.

In order properly to appreciate the respective shares of Pope Boniface on the one hand, and of cardinal James Colonna and his nephew Peter on the other, in that quarrel which helped so much to bring trouble to the former, we must return for a moment to his election. From the emphatically reliable evidence which has reached us, we can be sure, first, that Pope Celestine V. resigned of his own free will, and that both in his own days and ever since, the great mass of reasonable men have believed that

Causes of
the trouble
with the
Colonnas.

he had the right and power to resign if he wished. Secondly, there is no doubt that the Colonna cardinals voted that Benedict Gaetani should succeed him, and that, when elected, Boniface showed his goodwill towards them and trust in them by staying with them in their stronghold at Zagarolo on his journey to Anagni after his coronation.¹ Hence in estimating at its true value the conduct of the Colonna cardinals, one must never lose sight of the fact that the election of Boniface was in every way legal and valid, and that they knew it to be so, as they had themselves helped to make it so.²

Though then there was peace and apparent goodwill between Boniface and cardinals James and Peter Colonna at the beginning of his pontificate, it cannot be supposed that he had much confidence in them. They were known to be in the pay of Aragon; they were known, that is, to be in mercenary opposition to the unbroken papal policy of support for the house of Anjou.³ To curry favour with the simple Celestine, cardinal Peter had abandoned his brother cardinals, who were most wisely trying to keep him and themselves out of the power of Charles II.,⁴ and his uncle, in league with our King Edward, had contrived to wheedle an unprecedented concession out of the same simple pontiff which Boniface had felt bound to confirm.⁵

¹ Cf. *supra*, pp. 47 ff. "Post . . . coronationem . . . in castro tunc ipsorum, quod Zagarolum dicitur, et quod per dictum J(acobum) tunc temporis tenebatur, . . . fiducialiter extitit hospitatus, etc." See the reply of the cardinals to the Colonna manifestos, ap. Denifle, *Die Denk.*, p. 528. See also the letter of Boniface, "Lapis abscissus," ap. *Reg.*, 2389, May 23, 1297.

² "Qui (the C.) eum creaverant pro magna parte." *Mart. Pol. cont. Brab.*, ap. *M. G. SS.*, xxiv, p. 261.

³ *Supra*, Vol. XVII, p. 255. Cf. *ib.*, pp. 311-12.

⁴ *Supra*, Vol. XVII, p. 283.

⁵ *Supra*, Vol. XVII, p. 306. After Boniface has deprived the two cardinals of their property, James complained that among other items he

On his side, cardinal James was irritated against Boniface because the Pope, only most justly, opposed his illegal and cruel treatment of his brothers. In 1292 James' four brothers, John, Odo, Matthew, and Landulf, had, by a formal document, made James their eldest brother, the administrator of all the Colonna estates, including Palestrina, castrum Capranica, Zagarolo, Colonna, Algidus, etc.¹ This had been done on the death of John. Cardinal James, however, making common cause with John's six sons, namely with Peter, cardinal since 1288, Stephen, John, James well nicknamed "Sciarra", "the Quarrelsome", Odo, and Agapitus, robbed his remaining three brothers of their proper dues, reducing them to indigence.² Boniface tried every means to induce James and his nephews to behave fairly. He tried reason, entreaties, threats, and even presents.³ All to no purpose. Tired of being constantly reminded of their duty the two cardinals at length ceased to come near the Pope.⁴

James and his nephews were also, it appears, angry with Boniface because he did not give them that influence and attention which Nicholas IV. had done.⁵

had lost a pension of 500 marks sterling, which Celestine had given him. (See the charge of card. Peter C. against the Gaetani, n. 8, p. 217, ap. Mohler.) Was this another sum he had got out of Celestine?

¹ Tosti has printed the document, p. 489.

² See the famous indictment (processus) of Boniface against the Colonna cardinals. It really begins: "In excelso trono"; but the preamble is often omitted, and it is quoted as: "Præteritorum temporum." *Reg.*, n. 2388, May 10, 1297; Tosti, p. 490.

³ "Oblationibus factis nepotibus . . . Jacobi in avantagium ut hujusmodi concordia proveniret." *Ib.*, n. 2388, p. 963.

⁴ "Ipsi vero Jacobus et Petrus cardinales a nostra presentia recedentes, non facta hujusmodi assignatione . . . nunquam ad nos postea redierunt." *Ib.*

⁵ "Quibus (the sons of John Colonna) Bonif. non annuebat, prout annuerat Nicolaus IV." *Chron. Urbevet.*, p. 201, new ed. Even the Ghibelline, Pipinus, iv, c. 45, p. 744, allows that the enmity of the

The
Colonnas ally
themselves
with the
enemies of
Boniface.

More and more, therefore, did the Colonnas attach themselves to the enemies of Boniface. They encouraged Frederick of Sicily, and they favoured the Ghibellines of Tuscany.¹ What was much worse, they allied themselves with Spirituals, Celestines, Joachites, in a word with all those who were discontented with the resignation of Celestine, and with all those fanatics who, full of the vagaries of the Eternal Gospel, were looking forward to the advent of the Holy Spirit, and the ascendancy of monachism. Through them, they caused it to be spread about that Pope Celestine could not resign, and that consequently Boniface was not a true Pope.² Such conduct as that no Pope could pass over, as it tended to produce the greatest of all evils, a schism in the Church. Sifrid de Balnhusen (Siegfried of Ballhausen), who was in Rome in 1300, assures us that as early as 1295, the Colonnas began a systematic opposition to Boniface.³ His invaluable testimony is supported by that of William of Nangis, who has put it on record that the two Colonna cardinals were working, whilst the ex-Pope Celestine was still alive, to bring about a schism by spreading the idea that Celestine had been unduly deposed, and Boniface unjustly elected.⁴

Stephen C.
plunders
Boniface's
treasure,
1297.

Matters came to a head in the spring of 1297. Up to Colonnas to Boniface arose from the simple fact that he did not favour them. Villani (vii, c. 118, p. 317) tells how greatly N. IV. favoured the Colonnas, making Peter a cardinal, though to do so he had to cause his wife to become a nun.

¹ Bonincontro, *Hist. Sic.*, iii, 68, and a report, ap. Finke, *Aus dem T.*, p. xiii.

² Ferreti, i, p. 70, says that some "Columnensium impulsu", declared that Celestine could not resign.

³ The two cardinals: "opposuerunt se papæ B. non tamen adhuc cum effectu." *Compend. hist.*, ap. M. G. SS., xxv, 712.

⁴ *Chron.*, p. 292. "Petrus et Jacobus . . . cardinales, . . . vivente P. Cœlestino, schisma commoverant dicentes indebitam ejus depositionem, et injustum B. papæ promotionem extitisse."

that date the Colonnas had confined themselves to attacking Boniface with words.¹ Now they took to acts of open hostility. Boniface had ordered the treasure which he had possessed when simply a cardinal to be brought from Anagni to Rome. When it had arrived about two miles from Rome on the Alban road, Stephen Colonna, with a band of armed men, rushed out of ambush, seized the treasure and carried it off to Palestrina.² Alarmed by the threats of Boniface, cardinal James went to Palestrina, and, so we are assured, ordered the restitution of the treasure. For a while no notice was taken of the order, but, at length, Stephen's brother, cardinal Peter, sent back the treasure to the Pope intact.³ This act of violence would appear to have caused Boniface to fear for his personal safety. At any rate, Flemish envoys in Rome, making a report to their count (Apr. 2, 1297), told him that the lord Pope went out but little, and had himself more carefully guarded than usual.⁴

It was now for Boniface to act; the time for kind or any other sort of words was over.⁵ The two Colonna

Excommuni-
cation of the
Colonnas.

¹ The sons of John Colonna, " Spiritu superbix ex adipe R. Ecclesix impinguati, bellum et seditionem movent et verbis contumeliosis lacerant ac pejora minantur." *Chron. Urbet.*, p. 201.

² So the contemp. *Chron. U.*, *l.c.* Cf. B. Guidonis, p. 670; the *Annals* of Ptol. of L., *sub. an.*; the *Annals of Forli*, p. 55, new ed., etc.

³ *Chron. U.*, *l.c.* Presumably the treasure was returned between May 6 and May 11. See the second manifesto of the Colonnas, ap. Denifle, p. 517.

⁴ " Il se tient plus continuellement sour se warde qu'il ne soloit, et se fait moult près warder et pau ist (sort peu), mais à le fie fait-il célébrer en sa capelle, et là se fait moult grandement warder," ap. Ker. de Let., *Études*, p. 32.

⁵ How numerous they had been was strongly stressed later by card. Francis Gaetani. See his reply to assertions made by the Colonnas in 1306 to Philip le Bel, ap. Mohler, *l.c.*, p. 225. The cardinal speaks: " quam blandis suasionibus et exortationibus, quam dulcibus monitis, quam caritativis correctionibus, quam lenibus redargutionibus . . . d. Bonifacius . . . se habuerit cum eisdem."

cardinals, who, as we have seen, had for some time absented themselves from the Curia, were peremptorily ordered to appear before the Pope by a given date. According to the first manifesto of the Colonna cardinals, the order was issued about nine on Saturday, May 4 (1297), and they were required to present themselves before Boniface in the evening of the same day at the Vatican palace. They were to state definitely whether they regarded him as Pope or not.¹

The two cardinals did not obey the summons. In their first manifesto they declared that they had fear for their lives, especially as on the day in question the city was in commotion, and that on the following day (Sunday, May 5) they had caused their excuses to be notified to the papal court.²

However, according to their second manifesto against the Pope, they appeared before him and the College of Cardinals on the Monday; and, so they said, were required by Boniface to restore his treasure, to give up to him Palestrina, Zagarolo, and Colonna, and to see that their nephew Stephen surrendered himself for punishment.³ They add that through their influence the treasure was restored, but that Stephen would not surrender either himself or the castles.⁴

The
manifesto of
Longhezza,
1297.

Knowing that Boniface would not tolerate such resistance to his lawful authority, but showing thereby that they were hand in glove with their nephew and his doings, the Colonna cardinals sought to anticipate the blow which they knew would fall upon them. Gathering

¹ Ap. Denifle, *l.c.*, p. 509. "Audituri quid vellet dicere et mandare, quia volebat scire utrum ipse sit papa." Cf. the statement of card. Peter to Clement V. (Apr. 15, 1311).

² *Ib.* Cf. *Chron. Urbevet.*, p. 201, "At illi timentes comparere contemnunt et in arce Prænestinæ . . . se tuentur." See also the second manifesto of the Colonnas, ap. Denifle, *l.c.*, p. 516.

³ Ap. Denifle, pp. 516-17.

⁴ *Ib.*

round them, in the house of Peter Conti (de Comite) at Longhezza, five prelates, who were, significantly enough, seemingly all Frenchmen,¹ and three "Spiritual" Franciscans, one of whom was the famous Jacopone da Todi (James Benedict de Tuderto), they drew up what Gregorovius justly calls² their "clumsy manifesto". This was on Friday, May 10, "in the early morning before sunrise." The sum and substance of their declaration was that "Benedict" was not Pope at all. They give a number of sophistical reasons to prove that Celestine could not resign, and then assert that, even if he could, so much fraud accompanied the act as to vitiate it completely.³ They therefore prayed that a General Council might be summoned to resolve the whole question, and to this they meanwhile appealed against the tyrant. Finally "as far as in them lay" they forbade all clerics to exercise their pastoral office till the decision of the Council should be known.⁴

This blasphemous and lying document, as it is described by the Chronicle of Orvieto, was circulated everywhere,⁵ but, says the same chronicle, it made no impression.⁶

The
Colonnas
condemned.

The Colonna cardinals had not long to wait for the

¹ At any rate they were the provost of Rheims, the archdeacon of Rouen, a canon of Chartres, a canon of Embrun, and a canon of Senlis.

² *Rome*, v, 546, n.

³ "Item ex eo quod in renuntiatione ipsius multe fraudes . . . intervenisse multipliciter *asseruntur* quod esto quod posset fieri renuntiatio . . . ipsam vitiarent." Behold the origin of the tube and the other silly stories about Celestine's resignation!

⁴ The inflated pomposity of this impudent document can be the better realized when it is known that it occupies about six octavo pages. Denifle, pp. 509-15.

⁵ Ptol. of L., *Ann.*, p. 1301. We know it reached the King of France about the close of June. Cf. the process against Bonif. under Clement V., ap. Mohler, *Die Kard.*, pp. 252-3.

⁶ P. 201. "Sed eorum opinio non processit, nec eorum litteris Christi fideles præbuerunt auditum."

condemnation which they knew was coming. On the very same day (May 10), on which they had issued their impudent manifesto, Boniface published his condemnation of the two Colonna cardinals, and the sons of their brother John.¹ The Pope began by pointing out that Odo, the father of cardinal James Colonna, and Odo's uncle, cardinal John Colonna, had acted against the Church in the difficulties between Pope Gregory IX. and Frederick II. ; and that they and their descendants had also proved ungrateful to the Orsini family, especially to Pope Nicholas III. who had unfortunately made James Colonna, then young and inexperienced (*inscius*) but hypocritical, a cardinal. This James and his nephew, cardinal Peter, were ever in league with such enemies of the Church as the house of Aragon, especially now with Frederick, the *de facto* ruler of Sicily. Every effort had been made to wean them from their disloyal support of Frederick.² As words had failed, the Colonna cardinals had been ordered to surrender Palestrina, Zagarolo, and Colonna so that they might not be in a position to give material help to Frederick and his agents. Because they had refused to do this, and to treat the sons of Odo Colonna with justice, the two cardinals were deprived of their rank and excommunicated, and the sons of John Colonna, the nephews of cardinal James, and their descendants were deprived of any ecclesiastical revenues which they might possess, and were declared ineligible to possess any in future. Moreover the two cardinals were warned that, unless they appeared before the Pope within ten days, all their property would be confiscated.

¹ "In excelso trono," *Reg.*, n. 2388.

² Card. Francis Gaetani, in the course of the proceedings against the memory of Boniface in the days of Clement V., bore eloquent testimony to the persistent efforts made by him to win over the C.s to their duty. Cf. his evidence, ap. Mohler, *Die K.*, p. 225.

This severe but well-merited sentence had the approval, as the Pope and contemporaries inform us, of the College of Cardinals, of other prelates in Rome and a "large number of clergy and laity".¹

It will be observed that Boniface animadverted on the antipapal tradition in the Colonna family, but at no great length. This, however, is done by the author of the *Gesta Boemundi*.² He speaks, seemingly, from personal knowledge. For he says, among many other strong things, that Nicholas III., who had made James a cardinal thinking that he was a friend, thereby advanced the greatest enemy his house had ever known, and that, of cardinal Peter, his own father used to say that his pride would be the ruin of his house.³

Again the Colonna cardinals refused to obey, and on May 11 issued from Palestrina another manifesto against the Pope. In this document their language was still more intemperate, and their accusations against "the savage tyrant", Boniface, more reckless. There were the same excuses for not appearing before "Benedict Gaetani" and the same pretences of not being accused in proper legal form of any crime; but, this time, they went to the

Second
manifesto
of the
Colonnas.

¹ "Astantibus nobis dicto collegio . . . cardinalium et aliorum prelatorum, clericorum et laicorum multitudine copiosa." The said bull, ap. vol. i, p. 966. The *Chron. of Orvieto*, l.c., p. 201, says the same. James de Varagine says the cardinals were condemned: "propter quosdam graves excessus," ap. *R. I. SS.*, ix, p. 56.

² Ap. *M. G. SS.*, xxiv, p. 477 ff.

³ The author, who puts his words into the mouth of Boniface, calls card. P. "caput superbiæ", and says "Pater suus *pluries* dixit nobis quod esset ruina et destructio domus sue per superbiam quam habebat". He also bears out the assertion that he was the head of the Ghibellines, and that documents proved that he was an active agent of Frederick of Sicily against the Church. Machiavelli was no doubt right when he said (*The Prince*, c. 11) that it was the cardinals of the Colonna and Orsini families who were "the origin of the tumults among them". Villani's narrative of these events (viii, 21) is far from accurate.

length of asserting that Boniface had actually killed his predecessor.¹ They also, as before, with a puerile piling on of words, repudiated the jurisdiction of Boniface and appealed to a future true Pope and a General Council.

Second con-
demnation
by Boniface,
1297.

This second proclamation of the Colonna cardinals was soon (May 23) followed by a second condemnation by Boniface. On Ascension Thursday he issued his "Lapis abscessus",² by which he confirmed his sentence of May 10 against them; for their own writings, placed even on the altar of St. Peter's, showed them to be schismatics. They had no excuse for their acts, as they themselves, with the others, had elected him to be Pope, and for three years had acknowledged him to be such. Despite their condemnation they had continued to act as cardinals.³

Boniface further deprived of their benefices the prelates who had given their support to the Colonna manifestos, and proclaimed the sentence of excommunication against any who may give countenance to the rebellious cardinals.

A third
manifesto
of the
Colonnas,
1297.

About three weeks later, the two Cardinals addressed to the Chancellor and the University of Paris, as well as to the Princes of the world, a long diatribe against "the iniquity of Benedict Gaetani", and to show forth "the justice of our cause, or rather that of the spouse of Christ".⁴ Benedict, "not the prelate but tyrant" of the Church, owed his present position to crime. By fraud he induced Celestine to resign, then imprisoned him, and "as many say" brought about his

¹ "Et tandem morte crudelissima . . . in eodem carcere ut parricida crudelis eum faciendo miserabiliter expirare." Ap. Denifle, p. 516.

² *Reg.*, n. 2389.

³ "Annulis et rubeis capellis utentes." *Ib.* Boniface points out that it is no use their pretending that they acted through fear, as they honoured him as Pope even in their own castle of Zagarolo.

⁴ Ap. Denifle, p. 519 ff., Palestrina, June 15, 1297.

death. He then turned against us who were trying to prevent his ruining the Church. He wrung money out of all the prelates of the world by every kind of illegal pretext, by provisions, translations, dispensations, threats, etc. He would not listen to the advice of the cardinals, but boasted that even in temporal matters he was above kings, and that "by the plénitude of his power" he might do what he pleased. He had, moreover, conceived special hatred against them because they, with other great and learned men, had expressed their doubts as to the lawfulness of his election. Accordingly, when asked by him if they believed he was a true Pope, they had said no, and had appealed to a General Council to have the matter cleared up. Thereupon, in the most illegal way, he had deprived them, "cardinals," "*necessary* advisers" of the Popes, of their dignities and churches.

The University is, therefore, called upon to come to the assistance of the Church, and to work for the calling of a General Council so that the proceedings against them may be annulled.

Denunciation of the two rebellious cardinals was not left to the Pope only. The whole remainder of the Sacred College put forth an authoritative reply to what they call the poisonous lies and fables of their two colleagues.¹ They narrate at length the resignation of "Petrus de Morrone of good memory", because he realized his complete inability to perform the duties of his office, and his formal constitution setting forth that a Pope could resign. They then tell how cardinal Benedict was elected, and note that the now "deposed schismatical and blasphemous" cardinals, James and Peter Colonna, joined with them in electing him, and for some three years acknowledged him as Pope. In conclusion the cardinals

Declaration
of the whole
College of
Cardinals.

¹ Ap. Denifle, p. 524. They write "ad confundendum verba malefica, mendacia et figmenta Jacobi de Columpna et Petri nepotis ejus".

declared that, while without reserve they acknowledged the lord Pope as "the successor of Peter and the Vicar of Christ", they regarded "James and Peter" as mad, and wished the faithful so to regard them.¹

Active pro-
ceedings
against the
Colonnas,
1297.

As the Colonnas showed no signs of submitting to the Pope's orders, he soon began to take active measures against them. The inquisitors were ordered to institute proceedings against them (July 9),² and the "Roman citizen", Landulf Colonna,³ was instructed to join Inghiramo, count of Bisenzo, commander of the *Tallia* of Tuscany (or of the Florentine forces), and to take the field against the rebels.⁴ From the local records of Florence we see that the appeal made to it and to other cities of Tuscany by cardinal Acquasparta (June 26, 1297) for help against the Colonnas had been taken up with no little enthusiasm. Soldiers had been equipped and money subscribed "against those perfidious Colonnas, and against any other enemies of the Roman Church and the Pope".⁵

The Colonna property in Rome, especially that in the neighbourhood of Monte Citorio, was the first to feel the weight of the Pope's hand. Already by September 14, in a letter in which Boniface promised indemnity to all

¹ "Nos igitur ipsos Jacobum et Petrum reputamus non tam scismaticos quam insanos, et pro talibus a fidelibus universis habendos." *Ib.*, p. 529. Gregorovius, *Rome*, v, 547, says that "The deposition of the cardinals roused the indignation of the entire sacred college". The cold fact just set forth in the text will serve as a useful antidote to the heated imagination of this sparkling writer.

² *Reg.*, nn. 2351, 2387. Cf. Gregorovius, *Rome*, v, p. 548, n. 2; 549, n. 2.

³ Said by Petrini, *Mem. Prenest.*, p. 147, to be the "disgusted cousin" of the rebel cardinals.

⁴ Ep. of Sept. 4, 1297, ap. Petrini, n. 22, p. 419. It is dated from Orvieto, where the Pope arrived on June 6.

⁵ See various *Provisioni* and other municipal documents cited by Perrens, *Hist. de Florence*, ii, p. 442 f.

who took part against the Colonnas, it appears that the greater part of their property in Rome had already been sacked or destroyed.¹

Distressed at the destruction of property in the city necessitated by these warlike operations, the Senator, Pandulf Savelli, with the agreement of the Senate, sent deputies to Palestrina, and begged the Colonnas to submit to the Pope. As they agreed to his wishes, and accepted his mediation, the Senator then entreated Boniface to restore them to favour. At the same time, too, he expressed a hope that the Pope would return to Rome in the following spring. To the Senator's requests Boniface replied with distinct urbanity. He had, he said, received his envoys with paternal kindness, and had at once assured them that, if the Colonnas would come in person to him and surrender their castles, he would receive them with special clemency. Lest, however, the promises made might be merely idle words uttered to gain time, he had, he continued, given notice that proceedings would not be stopped in the meanwhile.

As to his returning to Rome in the spring, he had to say that in no place was he so anxious to live as that in which was his Apostolic chair, and in which he had already prepared his tomb. But his return would depend upon the result of the present negotiations.²

Boniface had understood the men with whom he had to deal. They were only playing for time. They declined to go near the Pope, but received envoys from Frederick

Intercession of Pandulf Savelli, Sept., 1297.

A Crusade proclaimed against the Colonnas, 1297.

¹ "Nonnulla etiam edificia, turres, palatia, domus et muros quæ dicti Iacopus et Petrus . . . et filii Johannis de Columpna . . . habuerunt hactenus infra Urbem Romanam et alibi, et specialiter in monte Acceptorio, necnon et turres . . . domos quæ vulgariter dicebantur Acri vel Accon dirui fecimus et vastari." *Reg.*, 2352.

² Ep. ap. Petrini, n. 23, p. 419 ff. "Cupimus in urbe ipsa quiescere, constructa jam in basilica . . . speciali capella ubi nostram elegimus sepulturam."

of Sicily, and from particular enemies of Boniface, such as the Romans, Francesco Crescenzi and Nicola Pazzi, and they went about continually stirring up mischief everywhere. The Pope, accordingly, solemnly renewed the sentences already passed on them (Nov. 18)¹; and then, especially in view of this last act of deceit,² proclaimed a crusade against them, granting to those who took part in it the usual indulgences given to those who went to fight against the Saracens.³ At the same time, he commissioned cardinal Acquasparta, bishop of Porto and Sta. Ruffina, to go to Lombardy and the other provinces of Italy to urge the people to take the cross against the Colonnas.⁴ So powerful were they that the ordinary papal levies were of no avail against them.⁵

Boniface did not appeal to deaf ears. His cause was warmly taken up. The General Chapter of the great Dominican Order which met at Venice (1297), not only forbade any member of the Order to give any kind of support "to those who have raised themselves up against our lord the supreme pontiff, the lord Boniface, and the Holy Roman Church", but ordered all its members when preaching and whenever an opportunity presented itself, constantly to proclaim that "the lord Boniface was the

¹ *Reg.*, n. 2390. *Cf.* n. 2386, Nov. 27, and 2883, March 3, 1298.

² "Hæc (their promises of submission made to the Senator) facere contumaciter contempserunt." *Reg.*, n. 2375, Dec. 14.

³ *Ib.*

⁴ *Ib.*, nn. 2376-81, Dec. 14, 1297. *Cf.* nn. 2383, 28 appointing preachers of the Crusade, Dec. 30.

⁵ Their power will be more apparent if we give the list of the places as enumerated by the Pope over which they had control. They could be attacked, he said, in "civitates Penestrinam, et Nepesinam, castra Columpne, Zagaroli, Sancti Viti, Rubianelli, Rubiani, Sancti Helye, Rivifrigidi, Normandorum, Columpne seu Sancti Terentiani, Vivari Laci, Pozalie, Communantie, Riviputei et Pontis Nepesini, tenementa, possessiones, territoria, et districtus eorum Tusculane, Penestrine, Tiburtine, Sabinensis, Balneoregensis et Nepesine diocesum et contra quevis alia bona".

true Pope, the successor of Peter and the vicar of Jesus Christ ".¹

Men took the cross in Florence, Siena, Orvieto, Matelica, and other places, as did also, naturally enough, the Orsini.² Money was raised from the Military Orders,³ and on the ground, it is to be supposed, that this campaign was a Crusade, from moneys collected for the Eastern Crusade.⁴ Transalpine clergy begged their people to send money to Boniface to enable him to crush those baleful children of the Roman Church, the Colonnas.⁵

The army of the Pope proved too strong for the Colonnas, and one of their fortresses after another soon fell into his hands, and were given over to the Orsini and other supporters of the Pope.⁶ Consequently, by the first of October, Boniface was able to tell the prelates of France that by the expenditure of large sums of his own, and of his subjects and friends, he had striven to subdue effectively the pride of the Colonnas and their followers, that Nepi and Zagarolo and other strongholds of theirs had fallen into his hands, and that the fortress of Colonna had been completely destroyed.⁷

At this time the only important place still in the hands of the rebels was Palestrina. Thither had retired the two

¹ *Acta capit. gen. O.P.*, vol. i, p. 284.

² Simone della Tosa, *Annal.*, p. 156; Villani, *Chron.*, viii, 21, and Petrini, *Mem. Prænest.*, p. 148, and the authorities there cited. For Siena see the document Apr. 3, 1298, published in an extract from *Miscell. Storica Senese*, nn. 8-9, Anno iii, doc. 34, pp. 45, 1895.

³ *Reg.*, nn. 2426-30, Feb. 23, 1298. Cf. nn. 2886-7, appeals to the Church of France for money.

⁴ *Reg.*, nn. 2643-6.

⁵ See the appeal of the dean and chapter of Tournay, ap. Kervyn de Lettenhove, *Études*, p. 22.

⁶ *Reg.*, n. 2248, 2264. The Orsini got Nepi. Cf. Ptolemy of L., *Ann.*, p. 1302, and *H.E.*, lib. xxiv, c. 1, p. 1219. Cf. *Reg.*, nn. 3911-5, Sept. 10, 1300. They had "specially" helped to take it.

⁷ *Reg.*, n. 2286.

Colonna cardinals with Sciarra and other sons of Giovanni Colonna. But even Palestrina could not hold out indefinitely against the papal troops, so that at last the Colonna cardinals "humbled themselves and on the Ides of October (Oct. 15) presented themselves before the Pope (at Rieti), and begged pardon for their transgressions".¹ We are assured that they came to ask "for mercy and not justice", and that "they were kindly and mercifully received by the Pope".²

The
Colonnas
again in
opposition,
1299.

From perhaps the best informed of our authorities on this matter, we learn that the Colonnas had come to the Pope because they found that, as they received no help from France, Sicily, or the Ghibellines of Italy, they could hold out against him no longer. Moreover, they came, not to demand terms ("nullam veniam petiture"), but, like the prodigal son, just to ask for mercy and forgiveness, "saying that they had sinned before heaven and before him, and were not worthy to be called his sons". The forgiveness they asked was granted them, and their stronghold of Palestrina was handed over to the Pope, who commanded them to reside in Tivoli until he had decided what sentence was to be passed upon them.³

¹ The "quondam" cardinals fled to Palestrina "ubi ab exercitu papæ obsessi tandem se humiliant, et idibus Octobris ad papam venientes veniam postulant de commissis", Rishanger, *Chron.*, p. 188, R. S. As the October date is confirmed by Will. of Nangis, *Chron.*, ad an. 1298, i, p. 304, it is clear that such ancient and modern authors as put this interview in September are mistaken.

² Will. of Nangis, *l.c.* So also says Paolino Pieri, p. 63. "Ai quali il Papa graziosamente e di buon'aria perdonò, ed assolvetteli della scomunicazione." So far, too, also agree *Chron. Urbevet.*, *l.c.*, p. 202, and Villani, viii, 23. For further flights of the imagination of Gregorovius, see *Rome*, v, p. 551. It will be seen that there is no room for the Guido da Montefeltro story. See *supra*.

³ "In civitate Tiburtina morari constituit quosque quod de seipsis facturus esset sententialiter definiret." *Chron. Urbevet.*, *l.c.*, p. 202. Card. Francis Gaetani testified very strongly to the completeness of

Let us hear now how Boniface himself, in a consistory at Anagni, told the story of the surrender of the Colonnas (Oct. 3, 1299).¹ After cardinal James and his nephews had sworn to submit to the sentence of the Pope regarding their offences, they were by his orders freed from the sentence of excommunication by the cardinal-bishop of Tusculum. They then presented themselves before the Pope at Rieti to beg his forgiveness. He received them in state surrounded by the cardinals and, as he said, wearing his diadem or crown which is commonly called the *regnum* (literally the *kingdom*), by which, he added, the unity of Holy Church (as a kingdom) which they strove to rend, may be typified. We received them with even maternal kindness, gave them hospitality and supplied their necessities with generosity. Then as we had to leave Rieti,² we fell in with their wishes and named Tivoli as the place where they should reside till we should decide about their case. Stephen, however, we ordered to go on a pilgrimage to the shrine of St. James at Compostella, but, as we have heard, he did not go.³

Meanwhile an earthquake, originating at Forli, and ultimately reaching to Rome, overtook the Pope at Rieti when he was about to say Mass (Nov. 30, 1298). Seven shocks were felt the same day. The papal palace was damaged, and many towers and houses fell, crushing

the surrender of the Colonnas at Rieti. See his evidence, ap. Mohler, *Die K.*, pp. 226-7, 229. The Colonnas ultimately pretended that Boniface had broken faith with them by the destruction of Palestrina, as their surrender of it was not unconditional. But the evidence given in the text and the subsequent confirmatory declaration of card. F. G. (*ib.*, p. 230) proves that this contention was false.

¹ *Reg.*, n. 3410. It is there dated Oct. 9, but as the date is given at the end: "V. non. Octobris," Oct. 3 is the date. See also n. 3420.

² By reason of the earthquake of which mention will be made presently.

³ Some modern writers are fond of speaking of the *cruelty* of Boniface. A pilgrimage as a punishment for the insolent bandit Stephen was certainly not a punishment of particular cruelty.

many beneath their ruins. The Pope and the cardinals dispersed, the former betaking himself to a friary of the Dominicans, which was on higher ground outside the town, and passing the night under a hut of boughs erected in one of their fields. Next day the shocks were even more numerous, for rescripts were issued by the Curia whilst shocks were still being felt.¹ When, some days later, Boniface set out for Rome, a terrible storm of thunder and lightning accompanied by darkness and a deluge of rain came on, and when (Dec. 14), having entered the city, he was blessing the people in the Lateran basilica, a great cross fell down within it.²

Destruction
of Palestrina,
1299.

The chief punishment inflicted by Boniface on the rebels was the destruction of Palestrina. From immemorial times, said the Pope, that city had belonged to the Holy See, and had been greatly favoured by it. Yet it had broken out in rebellion against it, and had adhered to schismatics. Wherefore, lest its example should be followed, Boniface not only deprived it of all its privileges, but ordered that it should be completely destroyed, that the plough should be passed over it, as was done to Carthage of old, and that salt should be sown in the furrows which it had made.

At the same time he commanded a new city, to be called *Civitas Papalis*, to be built below the old one. Moreover, in order to keep up the number of six cardinalitial sees, he transferred the see of Palestrina to his new city, decreeing that the church of St. Agapitus the martyr, in which he erected an altar to St. Boniface (IV.), should be the cathedral church.³

¹ Cf. *Mart. Polon. contin. Ang.*, ap. *M. G. SS.*, xxiv, pp. 254-5; *Ann. de Wigornia*, p. 539; Sifrid., *Compend. Hist.*, ap. *M. G. SS.*, xxv, p. 714; B. Guidonis, p. 671; Ptol. of L., *Ann.*, p. 1302, etc.

² *Ann. de W.*, p. 540.

³ *Reg.*, n. 3416; in some parts fuller in Raynaldus, *Ann.*, 1299, n. 6, June 13, 1299. Cf. *Mart. Pol. cont. Ang.*, ap. *M. G. SS.*, xxiv, p. 255;

These orders, at least as far as the destruction of Palestrina was concerned, must have been carried out in the spring of 1299, as Boniface publicly announced on July 13 of that year that they had been duly executed.¹

The Pope was evidently and quite justly determined that the Colonnas should not be in a position to defy him again, and to make it necessary for him to have to proclaim a crusade in order to bring refractory subjects to obedience. But the Colonnas would not brook the loss of their proud position,² and so, pretending that they were afraid that the Pope was going to maltreat them in their own persons, they again refused to submit to him and fled.³ This was at the beginning of July, and on October 3, Boniface, setting forth at length their evil deeds and their ingratitude, peremptorily summoned them to appear before him by the feast of St. Martin (Nov. 11).⁴ But the Colonnas had no idea of obedience and submission. They dispersed and fled to different parts. Some went to the Romagna where they had a stronghold,⁵ and to other places in Italy. But the heads

Renewed
rebellion and
flight of the
Colonnas,
1299.

Chron. Urbevet., l.c., p. 201. On the same date, Theoderic of Orvieto, cardinal-priest of Sta. Croce, was nominated to the new see. *Reg.*, n. 3417. A month later (July 13, 1299) the people of C. P. were granted all the rights of a city (Doc. ap. Theiner, *Cod. Dip.*, i, n. 534) after their property had been restored to them, July 1, 1299, see *Reg.*, n. 3406, or Petrini, n. 27.

¹ *Reg.*, n. 3416.

² Ptol. of L., *Ann.*, p. 1302. "Videntes quod non restituebantur statui, iterato rebellant." Cf. a version of Nich. Trivet, *Annal.*, p. 375, n., where it says that they fled because they had been more hardly treated than they had expected.

³ *Chron. Urbevet.*, p. 201; N. Trivet, *l.c.*, p. 375. Especially the letter of Jean de Menin to the count of Flanders: The Colonnas "ki tout ont perdu, et viles et castrans, et tenoient par le commandement dou pape prison à une ville k'on apièle Tyble (Tivoli), s'en partirent." Ap. Kervyn de Lettenhove, *Études*, p. 61.

⁴ *Reg.*, n. 3410. Cf. n. 3420.

⁵ Pet. Cantinelli, *Chron.*, p. 92, ap. *R. I. SS.*, xxviii, new ed. The people of Forlì, etc., afterwards drove them out of the castle.

of the family fled to enemies of the Pope. Thus, some fled to Frederick of Sicily, and the two cardinals, with Stephen, to the King of France or to his kingdom. The two cardinals were soon in receipt of financial assistance from Philip,¹ and came to be known as "the councillors of the King of France".²

Fresh
condemna-
tion of the
Colonnas,
1299.

When the octave day of St. Martin arrived (Nov. 18), and the Colonnas failed to appear before him, Boniface renewed all the pains and penalties previously imposed on them and on their followers.³ But the leaders of the party were now completely out of his hands. He had unfortunately for himself only scotched them, and not killed them, as all the laws of the time would have allowed him to do—at least as far as the non-clerical members of the party were concerned. When they fled, they professed to have been afraid that Boniface did in fact intend to kill them. But such a profession could deceive no one who knew the situation. Had the Pope ever had that idea, he would never have allowed them to choose for themselves where they should reside,⁴ nor would he have caused such little watch to be kept over them that every single one of them was able not only to leave Tivoli on

¹ *Chron. Urbevet.*, p. 202; Amalricus, *Vit. B.*, p. 436. Cf. p. 437, "inter amicos in regno Franciæ latitarent" (the two cardinals), Villani, viii, 23; Ferreti, i, 141. See also the famous bull of Boniface, "Super Petri solio," § 6, of Sept. 8, 1303, ap. *Bullar. Rom.*, iv, p. 168 ff. From a decree of Philip the Fair (Feb. 26, 1308) we learn that "formerly" he had assisted his "most dear friend, cardinal Peter Colonna, on account of the losses he had sustained in wars and unjust persecutions". Cf. A. Badouin, *Lettres inédites de Philippe le Bel*, p. 197, Paris, 1887.

² Hocesmius, *Chron.*, c. 29, p. 115.

³ *Reg.*, n. 3420. Cf. Potthast, n. 24893 of Dec. 19, 1299, against supporters of the Colonnas.

⁴ He fled, said Boniface, from Tivoli "loco quem nos, condescendo eorum voluntatibus, ad morandum ipsis benigniter concessimus". *Reg.*, n. 3410, Oct. 3, 1299.

the same night,¹ but to avoid being captured, and to escape to their Ghibelline friends.²

It would then seem that, as he had no thought of putting them to death, it would have been better if he had refrained from mortally irritating them by the drastic destruction of Palestrina, and by giving many of their estates to their deadly enemies.³ As it was, he allowed to escape his control, and to join every enemy he had, a number of able and unscrupulous men who would never rest, and, as a matter of fact, did never rest, till they had done him to death.

¹ "Clam seu nocturno tempore de Tibure recedentes." *Ib.*

² "Qui (those to whom the Colonnas fled), ut vulgari more loquamur, Gebelinos se nominant." He further notes that the Colonnas were Ghibellines, and regrets the insane enmity between the two parties. "Guelfi et Gebellini, quod dolenter referimus, ex inordinato affectu et ceco partialitatis errore, invicem se impetant."

³ Later on, Apr. 22, 1301, Boniface decreed that Palestrina, etc., had reverted to the Holy See. *Cf. Theiner, Cod. Dip.*, i, n. 552, Petrini, n. 30.

CHAPTER VII.

THE BRITISH ISLES.

General
relations
between
Boniface and
England.

THE relations between Pope Boniface and the Church in England continued on the same lines as in the days of his immediate predecessors. There were even the same abuses, and the same monetary difficulties; but, as our King Edward and the Pope had a mutual admiration for each another, there was not much friction between them.

As this chapter follows that on the conflict between the Pope and the Colonna family, we may open it by noting that the struggle was felt even in England. Members of that family or their supports held benefices in England. The sentence of the Pope deprived them of them, and he promptly nominated successors to them. On July 18, 1297, the Provost of Lausanne, Master Ottoboni of Piacenza and an official of the diocese of Lincoln, were ordered to put Theobald, the brother of the count of Bar le Duc, in possession of the canonry, prebend, and treasurership of York, which had been held by cardinal Peter Colonna, and that, too, even though the said Theobald was holding various other benefices in England and France.¹ Similarly the bishop of Lincoln was ordered to remove John de Ulseby, a dependant of the Colonnas, from the rectory of Letchworth, and to give it to John de Donnebrugge, of the diocese of Lichfield.²

Provisions.

“Provisions” continued to be granted by Boniface, just as they had been granted by his predecessors,³ but it would seem that he granted almost more at the request

¹ *Calendar of Papal Registers*, i, 572.

² *Ib.*, p. 597, Dec. 5, 1301. Cf. p. 580.

³ *Ib.*, pp. 596, 611, etc.

of others than of his own initiative. Thus, at the request of King Edward, "provisions" were granted to "his kinsman, Amedeus of Savoy".¹ They were also conceded by Boniface at the request of cardinals,² and of bishops,³ and even laymen, like Sir Odo de Grandison.

Among those granted by the Pope of his own accord were some to his nephew, cardinal Francis Gaetani, "son of Peter, count of Caserta, and commander of the military forces of Rome—*militiarum Urbis*."⁴ He even "provided" John, "the son of Octavian de Brunforte, a member of his household" with the canonry of Lichfield and the archdeaconry of Stafford which were vacant by the death of Master Rayner, a papal chaplain, though the said John was only a boy of twelve.⁵

"Provisions" were not unfrequently unpopular because they cut across the ordinary rights of patrons or others. But when, as very often happened, they were granted to non-resident foreigners, and even to youths at that,⁶ a good deal of opposition, as we have already seen, was, naturally enough, aroused against them.⁷ Sometimes, indeed, this opposition was reasonable; but at others, Boniface had cause to complain that it was groundless and captious.⁸

¹ *Ib.*, pp. 560, 580.

² *Ib.*, pp. 559, 580-1, 585, 595.

³ *Ib.*, p. 570, where we see the provision of the church of Adurbiri in the diocese of Lincoln is, at the request of John, bishop of Winchester, granted to his clerk, Robert of Maidstone. *Cf.* p. 594.

⁴ *Ib.*, p. 611. *Cf.* p. 596.

⁵ *Ib.*, p. 596.

⁶ Perhaps the worst case of this particular form of abuse of dispensation in the Register of Boniface, was that in which he allowed Walter, bishop of Coventry and Lichfield, to permit two nephews, aged respectively twelve and ten, and only in minor orders, to hold a benefice apiece. *Ib.*, p. 611. *Cf. ib.*, p. 595, for the case of the nephew of Luke, cardinal of S. Maria in Via Lata.

⁷ *Ib.*, pp. 594-6, for examples of this opposition.

⁸ *Ib.*, pp. 580-1. Quoting from his register, n. 2987, Feb. 17, 1299, "Advertentes denique quod in Anglia consueverunt ut plurimum

At times Edward and the Pope entertained different ideas as to whether opposition to a provision was reasonable or not. On Feb. 13, 1299, Boniface commanded Master Geoffrey de Vecano, canon of Cambray, to order Henry, archbishop of York, and other heads of the diocese, to appear before him within three months "to receive what they deserve" for having opposed a reservation of a deanery of York which he had made in behalf of Francis, cardinal of S. Maria in Cosmedin, and for having bestowed the said vacant deanery on William de Hamilton (Amelton, or Chameltone).¹ King Edward had already taken up this matter, and on January 7, 1299, had written to tell the Pope that he believed that it was the wish of the Pope to protect the churches. Now the cure to which his faithful clerk, William de Hamilton, had been elected, was a very important one, and had many burdens upon it, especially in the way of alms, which the King cannot allow to cease to be fulfilled. He therefore requested the Pope to withdraw his provision.²

It is to be presumed that Boniface had not received this letter before he dispatched his of Feb. 13. At any rate, after further correspondence³ Boniface regularized the position by causing Francis to resign, and providing Master William to the deanery in order to avoid litigation. The cardinal was to receive the next dignity in the diocese that was vacant.⁴

Though Edward was ready on occasion to oppose a

contra provisiones Apostolicas confictiones minus veraces opponi, cavillationes nequiter adhiberi, queri diffugia, impedimenta præstari, et occupationes inique presumi, etc."

¹ *Cal. of P. L.*, i, p. 580.

² *Cal. of Close Rolls*, 1296-1302, p. 294. Cf. *ib.*, for letters to various cardinals to support the King's wishes.

³ *Ib.*, pp. 309-10. Cf. (1302-7), pp. 66, 220.

⁴ *Cal. of P. L.*, i, p. 586, ep. of March 18, 1300.

particular provision,¹ he was not prepared to oppose the system, but was in the habit of asking the Pope to provide for his clerks.²

Besides granting provisions at King Edward's request, Boniface was constantly in the same way dispensing from the laws against "pluralities". The "King's clerks" were always receiving permissions from him to hold several benefices at the same time.³ We find him also, in order to favour the King, permitting one of his clerks, though only a deacon, to hold the rectory of Stonegrave in the diocese of York for three years without being ordained priest.⁴ For the same reason, he approved of a rule of a convent of Poor Clares at Waterbecte,⁵ granted matrimonial dispensations,⁶ and even in one case revoked his own decision relative to an episcopal election.

Henry of Newark had, on the death of archbishop John Romain, been unanimously elected to the see of York. But, as he did not appear before the Pope to have his election confirmed, the election was declared to be null. However, to gratify the King, Boniface accepted the election, and ordered the bishops of Durham and Carlisle to consecrate him.⁷ This latter concession was also in view of a request of King Edward who wrote to thank the Pope for his kindness, and begged him further to send the pallium to Henry, as travelling was dangerous, and as the King had constant need of Henry's services,

¹ *C. of C. Rolls* (1288-96), p. 515 f., Sept. 24, 1296.

² *Cal. of Close R.* (1302-7), p. 72.

³ *Ib.*, pp. 559-60, 567, 574, 577, 588, etc.

⁴ *Ib.*, p. 559.

⁵ *Ib.*, p. 562; cf. p. 566. Cf. *Cal. of Close Rolls*, 1288-96, p. 442, March 14, 1295, for the request of the King.

⁶ *Cal. P. L.*, pp. 570, 588.

⁷ *Ib.*, pp. 569 and 574, epp. of March 11, 1297, and Feb. 9, 1298.

seeing that he was his secretary.¹ When Henry himself, "with every expression of obedience and reverence," wrote to thank Boniface, "the supreme pontiff of the Holy Roman and Universal Church," for electing him to that see of York, for which the Apostolic Chair had a special regard and love, he said that he would ever find in him a humble and devoted son.² From his Register we see that the unfortunate archbishop was wellnigh worried to death for money. His predecessor left debt behind him, and "the fury of the Scots, who have burnt our manors and villages on the Borders, has reduced the income of the see by a third".³ Then there were the wars with the Welsh and the French which, of course, meant more money from his see,⁴ and the difficulty of transmitting money to Rome in the midst of all the troubles of the moment. He was, therefore, compelled to instruct his proctors in Rome to explain the financial affairs of his diocese to the Pope, and to beg him to prolong the period for the payment of the "commune servitium" and the other moneys due to the papal curia.⁵ Various cardinals, too, had helped his proctors to promote the cause of Henry's election. They, therefore, had also to be thanked and remunerated for their trouble.⁶ But the harassed bishop had to find not only money for certain cardinals, he had to find places for some of them ;

¹ *Letters from Northern Registers*, n. 77, p. 123, R. S.

² Ep. of June, 1297, ap. *ib.*, p. 131, R. S., with certain corrections from the Register of H. of N., p. 291, n., printed in the second vol. of the Register of John le Romeyn, Surtees Society.

³ Henry's *Reg.*, p. 299.

⁴ *Ib.*, p. 311.

⁵ *Ib.* "Scripsimus procuratoribus nostris ut, ostensis summo pontifici dampnis . . . ecclesie . . . quantum ad commune servitium, etc. . . . terminum ab eo petant quantum poterunt longiorem." About the transmitting of money, see pp. 293-4, and p. 304.

⁶ *Ib.*, pp. 289 and 296-9.

and in this latter case, to try to sail between papal provisions and elections of his own canons opposed to them.¹

Perhaps owing to these worries, Henry of Newark did not long survive the acquisition of his great dignity. He died on the feast of the Assumption of Our Lady (Aug. 15), 1300, and Thomas of Corbridge was elected to succeed. Thomas it appears was not only an excellent theologian, but what, says Thomas Stubbs, the old historian of the Church of York, rarely happens in the case of a single man, he was "the incomparable possessor of all the liberal arts". When elected (Nov. 12, 1300), he did not make the mistake of his predecessor. He went to Rome for papal confirmation of his election, and had the honour of being consecrated by Boniface himself (Feb. 27).²

In a letter by which Boniface authorized the new archbishop to borrow two thousand five hundred marks to meet his expenses in Rome, he protected him against the greed of the money-lender by decreeing that any transaction which involved "usury" was null and void.³ Unfortunately, he does not specify where "interest" ended and "usury" began.

As our historians and the Registers of Boniface have so little to say about the relations between him and various members of our hierarchy, it may be pardoned us if we relate some of them, as they illustrate the judicial dependence of the bishops of England on the bishop of Rome.

The bishop
of Coventry
Lichfield.

A certain knight, John de Lovetot, accused Walter

¹ *Ib.*, pp. 212, 297, 301, for the case of card. Francis Gaetani.

² Stubbs, *Actus Pont. Ebor.*, pp. 1728-9; *Gesta Abbat. S. Alban.*, ii, 49, R. S.; Walter of Hemingburgh, *Chron.*, pp. 186-7; *Annales Edw. I.*, p. 477, "Pro spiritualitate Curiam Romanam expetiit."

³ *Cal. of P. R.*, p. 586, March 7, 1300; *Reg.*, nn. 3475-6.

de Langton, bishop of Coventry-Lichfield, with having, by the aid of the said knight's stepmother, strangled her husband, John's father, and with having lived in sin with her both before and after the murder. Among a number of other crimes with which he accused him, were those of worshipping the devil and selling constitutions of the Pope himself.¹ So great were these crimes naturally considered, that, when Boniface ordered the archbishop of Canterbury, Robert Winchelsey (or Winchelsea) to cause the bishop to appear before him, he would not enumerate them. They were so wicked, so atrocious, so disgusting.² Knowing, as we do, that the charges against bishop Walter, who was the King's treasurer, were proved to be baseless and malicious, we need not be surprised to hear that he turned on Lovetot, seized some of his goods, and at first would not agree to appear before anyone to answer such preposterous accusations. Nevertheless, such flouting of lawful authority did not improve his case. Mandates came from the Pope to the archbishop of Canterbury, to the heads of the Dominicans and Franciscans in England, and to certain canons of Lichfield, not only to examine into the truth of the alleged charges against him, and meanwhile to cause the restoration of Lovetot's goods; but, as Walter had been suspended for contumacy in not obeying the summons to Rome, to administer his diocese both in spirituals and in temporals.³

Unfortunately for himself, Langton is said to have made an enemy of Winchelsey, the able but intransigent archbishop of Canterbury, who at the important parliament

¹ Ep. of Boniface, March 1, 1302, ap. *Cal. of P. L.*, i, p. 607.

² Ep. of Feb. 6, 1300. It is given in full in the *Chronicle of Lanercost*, pp. 172-3, Eng. trans.

³ Epp. of March 25 and 30, 1302, ap. *Cal. of P. L.*, pp. 600, 601; *Reg.*, nn. 4626-7 and 4637.

of Lincoln (Jan. 20, 1301) had been, it is imagined by some, at the back of the demand for the dismissal of Langton from his post as treasurer of the King.¹ However this may be, the Pope found through earnest letters of Edward in his treasurer's behalf,² that Lovetot was procrastinating, and so ordered the archbishop to push the case forward and report to him what had been done.³ Langton was, however, able to establish his innocence, and on June 8, 1303, Boniface withdrew the suspension of the bishop and the commission he had appointed to manage his diocese. He added that the bishop had at length come to Rome, though the knight had failed to obey the citation, and that from the investigations made both in England and in Rome, it appeared that the charges were not sustained. Among other things, it had been proved that the knight's father had died a natural death. The bishop had finally cleared himself by oath with no less than thirty-seven compurgators before three cardinals. Of all this the King and the chapters of Lichfield and Coventry were duly informed,⁴ and, says

¹ But for this idea there is no foundation. All that is known about the matter is that the barons demanded his dismissal for what they regarded as his maladministration:—

“And yet thei mad pleynt of his tresorere,

That fele thinges atteynt he mayntened thorgh powere.”

P. Langtoft's version of R. Brunne, ii, p. 312, ed. Hearne. Cf. *Ann. Edw. I.*, p. 454.

² Rymer, ii, 907, ep. of Aug. 24, 1302. “Prostrate at the feet of his pious Father,” he implored Boniface to oppose the malicious work of Lovetot. Cf., *ib.*, his letters to certain cardinals on the subject, and *ib.*, p. 931, where he gives a fine character to Walter whom he had known intimately from his boyhood upwards. Cf. *Cal. of C. R. of Edw. I.*, vol. v, pp. 81–2.

³ *C. P. L.*, i, p. 605, ep. of Dec. 6, 1302. Compare this with the letter of March 1, 1302, p. 607, already cited.

⁴ *C. of P. L.*, i, p. 610; in full in Rymer, ii, 932 ff. This case naturally cost the unfortunate bishop a good deal of money, and so permission was granted him to contract a loan of 7,000 florins to meet his expenses

one of our historians,¹ Walter was "sent back to his diocese with higher character and authority than ever".

New bishops
of Ely and
Worcester,
1301.

According to the last-named historian, the bishops of Ely and Worcester both died in the year 1301, and in each case a monk was elected to fill the vacant see. But, as they could not obtain the favour of consecration from the archbishop of Canterbury, both of them went to the Apostolic See. The election of Robert Orford, the prior of Ely, having been found in order, was duly confirmed by the Pope, for he said that he had found him to be anything but the "empty vessel" which the archbishop of Canterbury had declared him to be. When, after his consecration in Rome, Robert returned to his diocese, the archdeacon of Canterbury presented himself to enthrone him. But the new bishop would have none of him. "I enter my see," he exclaimed, "not by any authority of yours, but by the authority of the Apostolic See." ■

The See of
Worcester,
1302-7.

But the question of the election to the see of Worcester was not settled quite so easily. On March 25, 1302, John of S. Germano, a monk of Worcester, had been duly elected to that see, and on the following day had been accepted by the King. But as it appeared that he had consented to his election very unwillingly, archbishop Winchelsey would not confirm it.³ The matter was

at Rome. *Ib.*, June 17, 1303. The Pope had given Lovetot every chance of proving his case, and had even written to the K. to ask him not to bear malice against him for having accused his treasurer. Rymer, *Foed.*, ii, 900. Ep. Apr. 6, 1302.

¹ The so-called Matthew of Westminster, *Flores Hist.*, iii, 110.

² "Non ex aliqua auctoritate, quam te pretendis habere in me, verum Apostolica sedem meam ingredior auctoritate." Monachus Eliensis, *Hist. Eliensis*, ap. *Anglia Sacra*, i, p. 641.

³ At least such is the version given us by the *Annals of Worcester*, ap. *ib.*, p. 527, or ed. R. S., p. 551. According to the archbishop himself, the election was canonically defective. See the Worcester *Liber Albus* for a letter of W. dated June 22, 1303, p. 160.

thereupon referred to the Pope to whom John betook himself. But, according to the Annals of his city, he went without money, and without the proper people to guarantee his election.¹ He was accordingly ordered to resign by Boniface, who immediately conferred the vacant bishopric on William of Gainsborough, a learned Franciscan who had been brought from England a year or two before to be a professor in the Apostolic School.² Consecrated in Rome by Leonard, cardinal-bishop of Albano, "he was reverently enthroned at Worcester according to the custom of the Church of England."³ And so, adds the author of Worcester's Annals, "merely from want of money, the Church of Worcester lost a treasure." Here, to judge from our Annalists and from the papal letters, the matter of William's election would appear to have ended. But an entry in the Patent Rolls⁴ may perhaps be thought to indicate that King Edward was angry that a man of whose election he had approved should have been set aside by the Pope without reference to him. At any rate, we know that he was angry with William for presenting him with a bull in which it was stated that the Pope committed to him the administration of his diocese in spirituals and in *temporals*.⁵ Edward

¹ "Impecuniosus ac absque procuratore Capituli et comite monacho." *Ib.*, p. 555.

² *Ib.* Cf. epp. of Bon., Oct. 29, 1302, ap. *C. P. L.*, i, p. 604.

³ *Ann. W.*, *l.c.*

⁴ *P. R. of Ed. I.*, 1301-7, p. 421. From the Worcester *Liber Albus*, ed. by Rev. J. M. Wilson, D.D., we see that Boniface had many relations with the Church of Worcester. Doc. 31 shows a clerk appealing "to the Apostolic see for protection" against the Prior and monastery of Worcester (1301); docs. 57 and 96 (1302) show him granting firstfruits and indulgences for the building and repairing of the Cathedral; doc. 141 (1303) speaks of a new constitution of his about visitations.

⁵ Wilkins, *Concil.*, p. 266. More than once, owing to this wrong phraseology in the bulls of Boniface regarding the granting of the "spiritualties and temporalities" of a bishopric, we see Edward,

accordingly not only blamed William, but imposed a fine upon him. However, on being assured that the words "in temporals" had been inserted into the bull by mistake, we find it recorded that on March 21, 1306, he granted him pardon: "for certain words prejudicial to the King's dignity which were contained in the bull of Boniface VIII. collating him to his diocese, and remission of the fine of a thousand marks paid to the Chancery." ¹

Mortmain.

At a parliament held at Westminster on September 29 (Michaelmas), 1279, there was passed "on the advice of certain bishops and barons", a law, known as the Statute of Mortmain, in virtue of which corporate bodies were to be prevented from acquiring more lands, i.e., lands were not "in any wise to come into *mortmain*". The reasons assigned for the statute were that "the services that are due from such fiefs, and which at the beginning were used for the defence of the realm, are wrongfully withdrawn, and the chief Lords do lose their escheats of the same". ²

This statute was directed mainly against religious, and had to be amplified from time to time to deal with the various devices by which the law was evaded. ³ It did not arouse any particular opposition in Rome, and was not, seemingly, an attack, at least not a direct attack, on the papal authority in England. At any rate, both Pope and King combined at times to break the statute, and so we find Edward permitting the abbey of

after the mistake had been acknowledged, handing over the temporalities to the one "whom Pope Boniface has preferred to be bishop". Cf., e.g., *Cal. of C. R.* (1301-7), pp. 110-11.

¹ Cf. *Cal. of Close Rolls* (1301-7), p. 421.

² The law was passed on Nov. 15. Cf. *The Statutes at Large*, i, p. 72. Cf. *Annals of Waverley*, p. 393, R. S.; Wykes, *Chron.*, p. 282.

³ Cf. Lingard, *Hist. of England*, ii, p. 302; K. H. Vickers, *England in the Later Middle Ages*, pp. 65-6.

Peterborough, despite the statute of Mortmain, to appropriate the Church of Wermington in the diocese of Lincoln as Pope Boniface has given them licence to do.¹

At the period of which we are writing, the outstanding personages in Europe were Philip the Fair of France, Edward I. of England, and Pope Boniface VIII., and the three of them were perpetually in want of money. They were all in need of money partly from the same cause. They were all engaged in making war. Philip and Edward may be said to have waged war more or less wantonly to gratify their own ambition, whereas Boniface VIII. inherited the Sicilian war and, in helping to carry it on, was contending for his legitimate rights. Similarly in his war with the Colonnas, he was striving for his sovereign rights against rebels. However, whether wars are just or unjust, they cannot be waged without money, so that we find all these three rulers paying no little attention to it. As far as the records of history enable us to look on them, it would appear that Philip, whether he has to be regarded as a tool or as the guiding hand, was a really despicable character, and so it is generally believed that the means he took to raise money by wholesale depreciation of the coinage, were the most despicable.² Still, it cannot be said that the methods employed for raising money by Pope Boniface or King Edward were always estimable.

As a careful administrator, Boniface naturally exhorted his financial agents to be assiduous in the performance of their duties. On May 14, 1296, he exhorted Master Geoffrey de Vecano, his nuncio in England, to be diligent

¹ Cf. *Cal. of Patent Rolls, Edw. I. (1292-1301)*, p. 208.

² But it must be noted that Borrelli de Serres, *Les variations monétaires sous P. le B.*, Châlons, 1903, has given sound reasons to believe that the accusations against him under this head have been grossly exaggerated.

in the prosecution of the mission entrusted to him by Popes John XXI. and Nicholas IV. of collecting Peter's Pence and other papal dues in England, Ireland, Scotland, and Wales.¹ When we find him as late as Feb. 5, 1300, having to urge the collection of the remains due in England of the Holy Land tenth ordered by Gregory X., we can see that there was some need of greater diligence somewhere.² A little later (April), we see him making regulations about the like tenth which had been granted by Nicholas IV. to King Edward for six years.³ Then later, again (Dec. 5, 1302), he has to order the collecting of the said tenth to stop, in consequence of some neglect, if not collusion, on the part of the collectors.⁴

The bull
"Clericis
laicos", Feb.
24, 1296.

But the most sensational act of Boniface relating to money was his famous bull "Clericis laicos", dealing with the taxation of clerics. Whether the clergy in England, France, and elsewhere were, in proportion to other sections of the community, normally overtaxed in this age, is a question to which it is difficult to give a certain answer. To give such a dogmatic reply will not be attempted here. But there is no doubt that the clergy believed that they were overtaxed by Philip and Edward, and, under the circumstances, it is more than probable that they were.⁵ The ambitious enterprises of those two kings kept them in perpetual want of money, and the

¹ *Cal. of P. L.*, i, p. 564.

² *Ib.*, p. 585.

³ *Ib.*, pp. 587-8. *Cf.* p. 583.

⁴ *Ib.*, p. 598. Not all Boniface's concern for money was in his own interest. *Cf. ib.*, p. 599—a letter to the dean of London that compensation be made out of the said tenth to Sir Otho de Grandison who had suffered losses in the sack of Acre.

⁵ Hence Boutaric declares that "between 1247 and 1274, the Church of France paid twenty-one tenths" (*La France*, p. 279), and that the history of the reign of Philip le Bel "shows the Church of France was ruined by what it had to give to the public contributions". *Ib.*, p. 278.

clergy could be coerced much more easily than the barons. Then, too, no doubt, it was easier, by reason of the greater order in the accounts kept by the clergy as a body, to assess their incomes more exactly.

However all that may be, the clergy complained to Boniface of over-taxation. Accordingly, to quote the words of one of our contemporary chroniclers, Walter of Hemingburgh¹: "When the lord Pope had heard that not only the English Church, but the Churches almost everywhere were being (financially) oppressed, he took thought as to how he might devise a remedy. Thereupon, with the advice of his brethren, he sent to all the provinces of the world the following constitution duly sealed which had to be perpetually observed." One of the churches which urged the Pope to act was that of our own country.² This should be realized, as it is often made out that the bull in question was a merely arbitrary pronouncement of the domineering Boniface. The bull "*Clericis laicos*" then ran as follows³: "Boniface, servant of the servants of God, in perpetual memory of this affair. Antiquity teaches us, and the experiences of the present time make clear that the laity are hostile to the clergy; inasmuch as, not content with their own bounds, they aim at what is forbidden them. . . . Nor do they reflect that power

¹ *Chron.*, ii, p. 113 ff.

² The archbishop of Canterbury "*de consensu cleri procuraverat a Papa inhibitionem ne quis clericorum Regem respiceret de bonis Ecclesie*". *Rishanger*, p. 168, *R. S.*

³ *Reg.*, n. 1567. Cf. nn. 1653, 1644, 2308, 2312, 2355 for modifications and explanations. The modern "*Source Books*" dealing with the Middle Ages all seem to give translations of this bull; e.g., Henderson, *Hist. docs. of the M. Ages*, p. 432 ff.; *Readings in European Hist.*, i, p. 488, by J. H. Robinson, and *A Source Book for Mediæval Hist.*, by O. J. Thatcher, p. 311. Comparing them with the original, they are all accurate, except that Henderson, in giving Feb. 23 instead of Feb. 24 as the date, has forgotten that 1296 was a leap year. We have used the trans. of the last named for the most part.

over ecclesiastical persons and goods has been denied them.¹ On the prelates of the churches, on the churches themselves, and on ecclesiastical persons, secular and regular, they impose heavy burdens, and tax them. . . . They exact from them a half, a tenth, or twentieth² or some other portion of their revenues or goods, and they attempt in many ways to enslave them. . . . And, with grief do we record it, many ecclesiastics, fearing where they ought not to fear, seeking a momentary peace, and dreading more to offend the temporal than the eternal majesty, do, without any authority from the Apostolic See, and without foresight, acquiesce in these abuses. We, therefore, wishing to put a stop to these iniquitous acts, have, by the advice of our brethren and by the apostolic authority, decreed the sentence of excommunication, to be incurred by the very act, against any ecclesiastics who shall, without apostolic authority, pay to laymen, as levies or talliages (*collectas vel tallias*), the tenth, twentieth, hundredth, or any other part of their own or their churches' revenues or goods, under the name of aid, loan, subvention, subsidy, gift, or of any other designation whatsoever. The same sentence is to be incurred by emperors, kings . . . princes . . . podestàs, etc., who impose or receive such payments, or take or help to take possession of the belongings of churches or ecclesiastics which are deposited in sacred buildings, or receive them when taken possession of. . . . Under pain of deposition, ecclesiastics must not consent to such demands, and excommunication is to be incurred

¹ As far back as by the Council of Rome in 502, under Pope Symmachus.

² This sentence is cast in the form in which contemporary French historians formulated their complaints against the "*mala tolta*" tax. Cf. *Contin. Girard. de Frachet., Chron.*, ap. *R. F. S.*, xxi, p. 14; *Will. of Nangis, Chron.*, i, pp. 293-4.

by any who should in future pay or receive such imposts by virtue of any promise already made. From the aforesaid sentences no one, except in the hour of death, is to be absolved without the express permission of the Holy See . . .

" Given at St. Peter's on the sixth day before the Calends of March (Feb. 24), in the second year of our pontificate."

In considering this bull of Boniface, many points are often lost sight of. *Clericis laicos* did not put forth any new claim, but it did put forth a strong sanction for the enforcement of a then recognized clerical immunity. Freedom from taxation, and freedom from secular jurisdiction were taken as acknowledged rights of clerics springing partly from imperial legislation and partly from immemorial custom.¹ Boniface was, therefore, within his rights in endeavouring to maintain existing clerical exemptions. But Kings of rising nationalities were now engaged in trying to concentrate all authority in their own hands, and so, although Boniface had not absolutely forbidden taxation of the clergy, they affected to believe that he had, in order to attack and destroy a clerical immunity. No doubt, too, by making existing prohibitions still more stringent, and not leaving a loophole by means of which the goods of the clergy could, under any circumstances, be touched without reference to Rome, the Pope had himself prepared the way for the commotion which his bull aroused. The nineteenth canon of the second Lateran Council had permitted the clergy to give a voluntary offering in case the resources of the laity were not equal to the requirements of some public

Notes on
"Clericis
laicos".

¹ For previous ecclesiastical legislation on the subject, e.g., can. 19 of the second Lateran Council (1179), and 44 of the third Lat. C. (1215), etc.; see Tosti, pp. 167-8. Cf. Gosselin, *The power of the Pope during the Mid. Ages*, i, p. 134, etc.

necessity, but Boniface had forbidden the granting even of a gift without the permission of the Holy See.

Commotion
in France
and
England.

This bull, with its anything but tactful opening sentence, and its failure to distinguish between the goods of the Church properly so-called, and the fiefs held by churchmen, caused the greatest commotion exactly where one would have expected, namely, in England and in France, whose monarchs by their warlike ambitions were in perpetual want of money, and were bringing the greatest misery on their own and on other countries. In other lands the bull was accepted. The bishops of Castile assembled in council at Pennafiel (1302), ordered all the bishops in the province of Toledo to publish the bull, so that no one could profess ignorance of it.¹ James II. of Aragon, while deciding to ask the Pope's permission to raise money from the clergy and to receive the same modifications of the bull as we shall see had been granted to the King of France, ordered the collection of taxes from the clergy to cease in the meanwhile.² King Wenceslaus II. of Bohemia behaved in the same way as James of Aragon,³ and the Church in Germany acted like that of Castile.⁴ But, in England and France, the bull was met by an opposition both unreasoning and violent. In the former country it took

¹ Can. 6, ap. M. de Villanúño, *Summa Concil. Hisp.*, ii, p. 45. Cf. V. de la Fuente, *Hist. Eccles. de España*, iv, p. 405.

² "Et el senyor rey ha trames al seynor papa, que li placia, que puxa pendre les cens, axi con el et sos antecessors an acostumat. Et entro sapia la volentat del seynor papa, entena cessar de pendre les cens dels clergs et dels relgiosas." See a doc. of June 7, 1297, ap. Finke, *Mon. Aragon.*, i, p. 34 f. Cf. *ib.*, pp. 40-1.

³ See his letter to B. VIII. asking for a dispensation from the law to meet the expenses of his coronation. Ap. Raynaldus, *Ann.*, an. 1297, n. 51.

⁴ Cf. Tosti, p. 178, for the action of synod of Cambrai ordering the bull to be expounded to the people in the vernacular at least four times a year.

the form of a vicious attack by King Edward on the English Church, which was soon over, whereas in France it took the form of an attack on the Pope himself which, as we shall see, gradually degenerated into what can only be described as a loathsome mixture of foul mud throwing and outrageous personal violence.

Returning from a momentary subjugation of Scotland, King Edward, at a parliament at St. Edmundsbury (Nov., 1296),¹ demanded a new talliage for the protection of Gascony against the French.² “And there was granted to him by the citizens and burgesses the eighth penny, and from the rest the twelfth penny was extorted. But on that occasion the clergy neither offered nor granted him anything.”³ Archbishop Winchelsey, indeed, admitted the French danger; but he pleaded the impoverishment of the clergy owing to previous exactions, and then proclaimed the Pope’s prohibition.⁴ “On earth, under God,” he said, “there is no soul alive who has over holy Church power and mastery except the Pope of Rome, who holds the vicariate which St. Peter the Apostle had in his trust. The Pope is our head, he keeps and rules us; he has made a statute which binds us strictly, on privation of rent and prelacy, that tenth, nor twentieth, nor moiety, nor part no one of us can give to thee or to other without his commandment.” “Sir Clerk,” retorted the King, “thou hast spoken folly. Promise is debt due, if faith be not forgotten. . . . You will not be able to escape this aid.”⁵ As to the promise to which Edward here

King
Edward
demands
money, 1296.

¹ Acc. *Flores Hist.*, iii, 98, R. S., Nov. 11; acc. Parry, *The Parliaments of England*, p. 59, Nov. 3.

² *Ann. de Dunstaplia*, p. 404.

³ *Flores Hist.*, l.c.

⁴ Bart. of Cotton, pp. 314–15.

⁵ Pierre de Langtoft, *Chron.*, p. 27, R. S.

“And said, ‘Sir, God forbede, to greve the ony thing.

Sir, I schewe the here, for alle holy kirke

That no man has powere ther of to deme one wirke

Withoute the pape of Rome, Gode’s vicarie.’ Etc.”

Ed. Hearne, ii, p. 283.

alluded, it would appear to date from the Parliament held at Westminster in the November of 1295. The King had there in person asked the clergy for a large subsidy. The archbishop, thereupon, offered a tenth which Edward declared inadequate. As a result of pressure, the archbishop offered the tenth for a second year if the war was unfinished.¹ Finally, the King agreed to wait for a decisive answer from the clergy till the feast of St. Hilary (Jan. 13, 1297). Meanwhile he, on his side, caused seals to be set on the doors of all the ecclesiastical barns, while, on his side, the archbishop caused the Pope's bull to be published in all the cathedral churches.²

Ill-treatment
of the clergy,
1297.

On the appointed day (Jan. 13 or 14) the clergy met in St. Paul's, and were reminded by the archbishop that: "We have two lords over us, the King and the Pope; and, though we owe obedience to both, we owe greater obedience to the spiritual than to the temporal."³ The result was that, after a discussion lasting for eight days, the clergy declared that they could not in conscience make any grant at all. But they offered to send deputies at their own charge to consult the Pope.⁴

But Edward was resolved to break down opposition. The clergy were outlawed and denied justice in the King's courts. Their property, movable or immovable, on any of their lay fees, was confiscated. It seemed, says the chronicler, as if the days of Nero had returned.⁵ Some of the bishops and clergy, both secular and regular, gave way before the King's violence, and compounded

¹ *Ann. de Wigornia*, p. 524, R. S.

² *Flores Hist.*, l.c.; Walter of Hem., ii, 116; and Bart. of C., pp. 315-16, who describes this bull as "statutum ob favorem ecclesiæ", and that the Pope had ordered its publication in England.

³ Walter of H., l.c.

⁴ *Flores Hist.*, l.c., *Annals of Worcester*, p. 528, etc.

⁵ "Protinus adeo afflictus est clerus, ut quasi Neronis vesania videretur in Anglia recidiva." *Fl. Hist.*, iii, 99.

with him as best they could. Winchelsey, however, remained firm, and gained the day, for when the King attempted to treat the barons in the same way as he had treated the clergy, he found that he had overshot the mark, and that it was necessary to reinstate the outraged prelate in his favour and to restore his property, July, 1297.¹

Those of the clergy, whether secular or regular, who, unmindful of the warning of the monastic chronicles that one should be careful not to offend the dignity of the Pope,² had meanwhile compounded with the King, now found themselves in a "parlous state". They had had to pay to avoid the King's wrath, and it cost them money to get the Pope's absolution for their disobedience to him.³ But the archbishop who had "vowed to St. Thomas (Becket) that no one of his church should be taxed in future . . . without the command of the Pope, who ought to be their Governor",⁴ won respect from the King and praise from the Pope. Boniface is said to have called him "the sole invincible champion of the Church of England, and its unshaken column".⁵

If, however, Edward's treatment of the clergy in consequence of the bull "Clericis laicos" was tyrannical,⁶ Winchelsey appeals for modification of "Clericis l."

¹ *Ib.*, iii, 101, and 293 from the Rochester MS. of the *Flores H., Rishanger*, p. 172; Pierre de Langtoft, *Chron.*, pp. 278-9, R. S. As a contemporary of Edward the work of Pierre is of great value; and as a citizen of the north of England he is naturally enough anti-Scotch. Cf. also W. of Hem., ii, 122; and *Close Rolls* of Ed. I., vol. iv, pp. 42 and 120, R. S.

² "Sed caveat unusquisque ne Papalis dignitas offendatur." *Ann. of Wor.*, p. 529, R. S.

³ On May 4, 1301, the convent of Merton was absolved for paying the subsidy to the King. Cf. the *Register* of John de Pontissara, i, p. 106; and the *Gesta Abbat. S. Alb.*, ii, p. 26 f., R. S., tells of abbot John III. getting absolution for the same offence "prece pecuniari".

⁴ Pierre de L., *l.c.*

⁵ S. Birchington, *Vitæ arch. Cantuar.*, p. 16, ap. *Ang. Sac.*, i.

the action of Boniface in its publication was inconsiderate. Many saw that he had no right to interfere with the taxation of the lay fees held by churchmen, and that the bull had not been drawn up with the care necessary to provide for exceptional circumstances. Thus, in the very midst of the disturbance caused by its publication, the Scots made a formidable inroad into the country. Money had, of course, to be raised to resist it. It was only fair that the clergy should pay their share to repel the incursion, and it was quite impossible to wait for the permission of Rome before the money could be levied. Accordingly, Winchelsey and his suffragans at once granted the King a tenth of their revenues, and then wrote to the Pope to excuse their action.¹ But elsewhere they also pointed out to him that "Clericis laicos" placed them in a very difficult position with regard to their obligations to the secular power.² The bull had either gone further than they had desired, or perhaps it had been met by the King more forcibly than they had anticipated. We may take it that the difficulty terminated for the moment by the extension to England of the modifications or explanations of the bull which had been made for France.³ In a number of bulls, addressed to various French bishops, Boniface explained that his constitution did not touch

¹ Wilkins, *Concil.*, ii, 232, an. 1297. Hart (*Ecclesiastical Records*, p. 45. His work is an epitome of Wilkins), whom we are quoting, says that the letter was written in what he is pleased to call "a style of the most servile adulation".

² See the *Register* of John de Pontissara, vol. i, p. 201. This letter of the archbishop to Boniface is not dated, and would appear not to be printed *in extenso* on p. 201. Hence it may not refer to "Clericis laicos", but to some other Statutes.

³ Cf. *Reg.*, n. 1653, Sept. 20, 1296, "Ineffabilis amoris"; n. 2312, Feb. 7, 1297, "Romana mater"; n. 2355, July 27, 1297, "Ab olim," and especially n. 2354, July 31, 1297, which, leaving the consciences of the King and his ministers the judges of what constituted a case of necessity, practically negated the bull "Clericis laicos".

the fiefs held by ecclesiastics, and that it was not meant to interfere with individuals making presents to the King,¹ nor with the granting of talliages in case of necessity,² such as, for instance, for the ransoming of the King or his sons.³ At any rate, on the feast of St. Andrew (Nov. 30) 1301, we see the whole clergy of England granting the King, without raising the smallest difficulty, a tenth "for the second time (iterato) by the assent and order of the Pope".⁴

Ultimately "Clericis laicos", with the explanations that followed it, were all withdrawn by Pope Clement V. by his bull "Quoniam ex constitutione" (Feb. 1, 1306). As scandals had resulted from them, Clement declared that they were withdrawn on the understanding: (1) that the penalties enunciated by Boniface were only to fall on such laymen as extorted talliages and the like from churches and churchmen, and on such as aided them; and (2) that in the levying of the said taxes the decrees of the General Councils are to be observed, and the particulars and necessity of them are to be sent to the Holy See for its approval.⁵

As there remain to be treated of in this chapter the important relations between Edward and Boniface with regard to Scotland, more space cannot here be devoted to the other relations between Winchelsey and the Pope, and to the further financial relations between Edward and the Pope. It can only be said in brief that, ever keen and unfaltering in the pursuit of what he believed his rights, the archbishop did not hesitate to request Boniface to remedy what he regarded as grievances on

Clement V.
withdraws
"Clericis l.,"
1306.

Other
relations
between
Winchelsey
and the
Pope.

¹ N. 1653.

² N. 2312.

³ N. 2355.

⁴ *Ann. London.*, i, p. 103, R. S.

⁵ Ap. Guerra, *Pontific. Constit. Epitome*, iii, p. 71, n. 13; or ap. Dupuy, *Hist. du diff.*, p. 387 f.

the part of the Roman curia,¹ nor on the other hand, to beg papal support to help him to fight infringements of ecclesiastical liberty which were taking place in England.² In spite of all his efforts, the monks of St. Augustine's, Canterbury, procured against him from Boniface confirmation of the papal privileges which granted them exemption from his jurisdiction.³

Financial
relations
with
Edward.

To give a wider view of Edward's financial relations with Boniface, another fact or two may be summarily inserted here. On a par with many another of his tyrannical acts in the matter of raising money, Edward had ordered his officials to seize the tenths which had been collected in Ireland for the Holy Land as well as the goods of some of the merchant bankers. Boniface had to exhort his "most beloved son" to order the release of the goods, and to suffer the tenths to be withdrawn from the country and devoted to the purpose for which they were collected.⁴ Yet, a few months later, as the King is getting old, the Pope grants him, for the sake of his immortal soul, pardon for having used the Holy Land tenths for his own purposes.⁵ Nevertheless, about the same time, he asks the King to pay up the annual tribute which, including the present year (1301), is twelve years in arrears.⁶ In the following years a tithe had been imposed on the ecclesiastical revenues of England and

¹ Wilkins, *Concilia*, ii, p. 234 (1297), ap. Hart, *Eccles. Records*, p. 45. The archbp. complained of excessive procurations demanded by the cardinals who recently came to England; that the papal nuncio demanded more in the way of Peter's Pence than the dioceses had been in the habit of paying.

² Cf. *Reg. of John of Pontissara*, i, p. 201 ff.

³ Cf. *Cal. of P. L.*, i, pp. 585-6, 608, 614-15; *Lit. Cantuar.*, i, 61-3, R. S., and Thorn (bitterly hostile to Winchelsey), ap. Twysden, *Script.*, pp. 2004-5.

⁴ Ep. ap. Rymer, ii, 872.

⁵ *Ib.*, pp. 875, 882.

⁶ *Ib.*, p. 882, March 18.

Ireland to relieve the needs of the Roman Church. Thereupon Edward informed the Pope that war had exhausted his treasury also. Boniface took the hint, and saying that he would rather suffer himself than fail to help the King, granted him half the said tithes.¹ Under the circumstances, then, we need not be surprised to see Edward pushing on the collection of the money with considerable zeal, nor that he even overdr̄ew his share of the tithe. He promised, however, to repay the overdraft at the Pope's will when called upon by any of his collectors to do so.²

One of the causes of Edward's perennial want of money was his wars with Scotland. We have seen how, through guile, as our historians assert, Baliol got absolution from Celestine V. from his oath of homage to the King of England.³ Then, allying himself with Philip of France, he renounced his allegiance to Edward and declared war on England (Apr. 5, 1296).⁴ But the great defeat which he sustained soon after (Apr. 27) deprived him of his regal independence and his personal liberty. But the Scots, if defeated, were not crushed, and again, according to English authorities, a new rising was brought about by prisoners who had been allowed to return to Scotland after having taken an oath of allegiance to Edward (1297).⁵ They obtained armed assistance from France, and when Edward was absent in Flanders, invaded England under "that fox" (vispilio), William Wallace.⁶

War
between
England and
Scotland,
1296.

¹ Ep. March 12, 1302, ap. Raynaldus, an. 1302, n. 17, or Theiner, *Mon. Hibern.*, n. 370.

² *Cal. of C. R. of Edw. I.*, vol. v, p. 9, Jan. 26, 1303; *Cal. of Pat. Rolls* (1301-7), p. 27. Cf. pp. 52, 114; and *Cal. of Fine Rolls*, vol. i, p. 478, June 14, 1303.

³ *Supra*, Vol. XVII, p. 306. Cf. *Eulog. Hist.*, iii, 158-9.

⁴ *Ib.*, p. 160, Rymer, ii, 707.

⁵ *Eulog. Hist.*, l.c., p. 165.

⁶ *Ib.*, 165-6.

But the English King returned to his country in the spring of the following year (March 14, 1298), hurried to the north, and inflicted a severe defeat on the enemy at Falkirk (July 22). About a month after this battle Edward will have received a letter which Boniface wrote to him on July 10. In it, the Pope reminded him of his sojourn in England with the cardinal-deacon of St. Hadrian, afterwards Hadrian V., and told him that when there he had learnt to love his father and himself on account of their zeal and affection for the Roman Church. This love had made him spare no exertion to bring about a peace between England and France, and now his love of peace, and of the good of the Holy Land moves him to beg the King not to wage war on Scotland.¹

Boniface
claims
Scotland as a
fief, 1299.

Unable to face Edward in the field, the Scotch tried to get him out of their country through the Pope. In his *Scalacronica*, the Northumbrian, Sir John Gray, relates how "owing to the diligence of persons in Scotland, and the setting forth of all the evidence they could devise, letters came from Pope Boniface to King Edward . . . declaring that the realm of Scotland was held in fief of the Court of Rome, and that he had intruded to the disinherittance of the Roman Church, desiring him and admonishing him to remove his hand".² The letter to which the chronicler refers is dated June 27, 1299, and as he says, sets forth that "from ancient times Scotland pertained to the Roman Church, and does so still".³ The Pope begged Edward to leave the country in peace, to free the prisoners he had taken, especially the bishops

¹ Rymer, ii, 827.

² P. 22, ed. Sir H. Maxwell. Cf. Fordun, *Scotichronicon*, lib. xi, c. 35.

³ The King says the Pope will remember "qualiter ab antiquis temporibus Regnum Scotiæ pleno jure pertinuit, et adhuc pertinere dinoscitur ad Ecclesiam (Romanam)". Rymer, ii, 844 ff.

and other ecclesiastics, and to recall his officials from Scotland. If, however, he believed that he had any claim to the country or any part of it, he asked him to send envoys to prove his claim.

A week or so later (July 7) nuncios from Boniface arrived in England begging Edward to release John Baliol, the dethroned King of Scotland, assuring him that their master the Pope would make himself responsible if any harm should come to England in consequence of the King's clemency. On this understanding, Edward handed over Baliol to the nuncios who took him to his estate in France (Bailleul) whence his family derived their name. There, with several bishops responsible for him, the unfortunate king passed the rest of his days († 1315).¹

From the very beginning of his pontificate, as we shall see, Boniface worked without ceasing to make a permanent peace between England and France. He succeeded at last (Nov. 19, 1298), and it was hoped that Scotland might ultimately be included in it.² But after some hesitation, Edward refused to consent to its inclusion, and the Scottish trouble continued. After the capture of Baliol, the Scotch had appointed a regency with John Comyn, Robert Bruce, and others at its head, and towards the close of the year 1299, had succeeded in seizing the strong castle of Stirling. Edward, who had hoped that serious opposition to him had been crushed by the battle of Falkirk, was furious at the resistance offered to him. Though to get funds for his expedition involved him in difficulties with the Pope and his clergy, and caused him to have to give up some of his most valued

Baliol released at Pope's request.

Edward marches into and retires from Scotland, 1300.

¹ *Rishanger*, p. 191, R. S. In the same vol., pp. 390-1, cf. *Annales Angliæ et Scotiæ*, which, however, is not quite accurate. See also, *Eulog. Hist.*, iii, 170.

² For the peace was not finally concluded by the acceptance by the two Kings of the award of Boniface till the summer of 1299.

prerogatives, he was resolved to subdue Scotland. Accordingly, in the beginning of July, 1300, he entered that country with a large army; but, as the Scots avoided a pitched battle, he was not able to effect much against them. Whilst engaged in subduing Galloway, our indefatigable King had for a few days his headquarters at Sweet Heart Abbey, situated a few miles from Dumfries.¹ Here in great haste on Friday, August 26, arrived the archbishop of Canterbury with a letter from the Pope. In it Boniface gave arguments to show that Scotland was not a fief of England, but that it was dependent on the Holy See. Edward was, therefore, exhorted not to interfere further with it.²

Winchelsey had been ordered by the Pope, under pain of suspension, to deliver without delay this letter to the King with his own hands, and to let him know on what day he presented it, and what action the King took in the matter.³ Fortunately, the archbishop's reply to the injunction of Boniface is extant, and is a most interesting document. In the ordinary course, he will have received the Pope's letter about the beginning of August, and he

¹ It is certain he was there from Tuesday, Aug. 23, to Sat., Aug. 27, 1300, inclusive. See Gough, *Itinerary of Ed. I.*, ii, p. 192.

² This is the same letter (ap. Rymer, ii, 844) which we have quoted already. It is everywhere (including the *Register* of Boniface, n. 3343) dated June 27, in the *fifth* year of our pontificate (anno V), i.e., 1299. This letter was accompanied by another to the archbishop of Canterbury (dated June 28, 1299) in which he is ordered personally to deliver the previous letter to the King without delay, and to let the Pope know he had done so. Now the archbishop's report thereon can *only* belong to the autumn of 1300 (it is in fact dated Oct. 8, 1300), and states that he obeyed the Pope's orders immediately. The said letters of Boniface, therefore, must belong to 1300. "Anno V." must be a mistake for "Anno VI." In the papal register they come after letters dated Dec., 1299, and perhaps were added by mistake to the letters of that year.

³ *Reg.*, n. 3342, or in full in *Mat. of West.*, sub an. 1301. See the preceding note.

set out at once for what he describes as a "twenty moderate days' journey or thereabouts". When, "travelling incessantly and with all haste," he reached Carlisle, he found that the King and his army had already crossed the Solway, and had penetrated into the centre of Galloway. He also learned that to attempt to get to the King would be very dangerous, as the roads were beset by the Scotch and by robbers. However, under the necessity "to show obedience", he contrived, after some delay,¹ to cross the Solway, so dangerous by reason of its quicksands and rapid tides, and reach the King at "Duzquer" (Sweet Heart) "on the Friday next after the feast of Saint Bartholomew, the Apostle, last past" (i.e., Aug. 26). On the following day the letter of the Pope was formally presented to the King by the archbishop. After it had been translated into French, and its contents discussed by the King and his nobles, Edward informed the archbishop that he would himself send a reply to it when it had been considered by the prelates and nobles of his kingdom.

Soon after this, the English evacuated Scotland, and Edward issued writs for a parliament to meet at Lincoln to examine the Pope's claims.² On the octave day of St. Hilary (Jan. 20), a large number of prelates, nobles, and "magistri learned in the law" assembled in the prescribed city,³ and, among other questions, deliberated

The parliament of Lincoln, 1301.

¹ He says of "nearly six weeks". Unless the papal letters to Edward and the archbp. are wrongly dated as to the month as well as to the year, I cannot find a chronological place for the "six weeks". Possibly we should read six *days* for six *weeks*.

² Writs were also issued Sept. 26, 1300, to various abbots, etc., to search their chronicles and archives regarding the King's claims to Scotland, and to send the results of their researches to the parliament at Lincoln. The Universities of Oxford and Cambridge were also ordered to send learned men to the same parliament to discuss the said claims. *Rymer*, i, pp. 923-4, Rec. ed.

³ Cf. C. H. Parry, *The Parliaments of England*, p. 63.

on the contention of the Scots and the Pope that Scotland was in temporals as well as spirituals subject to the Holy See.¹ The barons of England met the contention simply by a direct denial; and one hundred and four of them signed a letter to Pope Boniface in which, subscribing themselves his devoted sons, and sending devout kisses to his blessed feet, they declared that it was their belief that their Holy Mother the Roman Church, by whom the Catholic faith is regulated, ever so acts as not to deal prejudicially with anyone. But they were astonished at certain statements made in a recent letter of his because it is notorious that the Kings of England have ever had direct dominion over Scotland; and, as to its temporalities, it has never been subject to the Roman Church. Wherefore, after having carefully considered the Pope's letters, they have to assert that they cannot suffer their King to answer judicially to him regarding his rights over Scotland or any other part of his temporal possessions.

"Wherefore we reverently and humbly beg your Holiness to allow our King (who among the other Princes of the earth is especially Catholic and devoted to the Roman Church) to keep his rights . . . without diminution and in peace."²

The King's
reply to the
Pope.

However, as the Pope had used arguments to show that the Scots acknowledged him as their overlord and not the King, Edward in his reply to the Pope employed counter-arguments to prove that the Scotch were his subjects. He had commanded the historical records of the country to be searched in order that the relations between the two countries might be brought to light.

¹ Such was the contention which the Scotch made: "Et quod in temporalibus immediate sit subditum eidem Romanæ ecclesiæ regnum ipsum Scotiæ, etc." Fordun, *Scotichronicon*, xi, c. 54. Cf. cc. 56, 57, etc.

² Rymer, ii, 873, Feb. 12, 1301.

With the facts with which this investigation supplied him, he was able, in a long letter which he sent to Pope Boniface from Kempsey (May 15, 1301), to offer a presentable case for his claim. The Pope, acting on the statements of the Scots themselves, and following the example of Nicholas IV.,¹ had maintained that Scotland belonged of full right to the Holy See, and had supported his contention by historical proofs. He had, for instance, urged that when at war with Simon de Montfort, Henry III. had asked the King of Scotland for help not as a feudal service due to him, but as a favour.² In replying to the Pope, Edward began by making it clear that his letter was not to be regarded as an exculpatory document submitted to a judge, but as an explanation of the position for his information. Then he declared that it must be known to the Pope that the Kings of England have, "from the most ancient times that it is possible to go back to," been lords of Scotland by the right of direct dominion. Proceeding to refer to those, indeed, most ancient times, the King gave a most wonderful history of the early Kings of Britain, of the Trojan Brutus, of Arthur, "that most famous King of the Britons," and of other British Kings who, of course, all ruled Scotland. Following the British Kings, came the Saxon, and they too kept the Kings of the Scots in subjection. Edward acknowledged that at times the Scots had rebelled; but, by the sword and even by miracle, they had always been brought back to their duty. In 1070 William the Conqueror had received the homage of Malcolm, King of Scotland, and so on, as the King related at length with regard to the other Kings of England down to his own time. Even Popes, Gregory IX., and others, had in their letters noted that various Kings

¹ Cf. *supra*, Vol. XVII, p. 224.

² See the letter, ap. Rymer, ii, 844.

of Scotland had done liege homage to Kings of England. Finally the whole history of John Baliol proves that the Scotch acknowledged Edward's own overlordship. In conclusion, he "humbly entreated his Holiness" to weigh well what he had advanced, and to judge of them without being swayed by the suggestions of his enemies. "May Almighty God preserve you through long and prosperous years to rule his holy Church." ¹

Reply of the
Scotch.

On receipt of the letters of Edward and his barons, Boniface handed them over for examination to the Scottish envoys, Baldred Biset and others.² In their attack on the position taken up by the English, the envoys made a strong point out of their declining to accept the jurisdiction of the Apostolic see "to which the Kingdom of Scotland belongs". In view of the overlordship of Christendom then acknowledged to pertain to the Pope, the Scots contended that in refusing to acknowledge his jurisdiction in the dispute, the English King acted "not without contempt of his see, with no little prejudice to his jurisdiction, and with a daring attempt to restrict the ordinary jurisdiction of the said Roman Church, and its most ample acknowledged power which especially concerns kings and kingdoms. His action, too, is not without bad example, nor without the danger of opening the way to forbidden subterfuges and of inflicting injury on the law, if, without any legal

¹ Rymer, ii, 883-90. Cf. Wynboun, *The Cronykil of Scotland*, l. viii, c. 15, who tells how:—

"The Kyng off Ingland, this Edwart,

This Kyng than feybrnyd evydens

And sygnyfyid to the Pape rycht swne,

Quhat he in Scotland gert de dwne. Etc."

² Fôrdun, *Scotichronicon*, xi, c. 46. On all this matter, see *ib.*, c. 35-63, ii, pp. 176-218, ed. Goodall.

right or any legitimate and approved reason the jurisdiction of the ordinary judge, i.e., the sovereign pontiff, can be declined".¹

As the kingdom of Scotland, the envoys continued, belongs to the Holy See, and as, by the natural law (*de jure communi*) one king has no jurisdiction (*imperium*) over another, the only competent superior judge in the present case is the Roman Church. Her pre-eminent (*præcellens*) authority does not suffer her subjects to be ruled by force, but by right. Accordingly, should there be question of the uniting of kingdoms, it cannot be by force, but only by the said see.²

Then, to use a modern phrase, as Edward had gone to the back of the historical beyond to try to prove that Scotland had always been subject to England, the Scots did the same to show that it had always been independent of her. They were descended from Pharaoh's daughter, Scota, whose name was given to the northern part of Britain, when her descendants took it from the offspring of Brutus. Further, as Edward is a Norman, he cannot claim to inherit any advantages gained over Scotland by the Saxons; and no Scotch King ever paid homage to a Norman King for the kingdom of Scotland, but only for

¹ Fordun, *l.c.*, xi, 47. In this striking passage the Scotchmen not only clearly expressed the political position of the Pope in Christendom at this period, but as clearly foretold that action such as that of Edward would be fatal to it. Frederick II., to some extent, Edward I., and, to a great extent, Philip le Bel fatally loosened the political structure of mediæval Europe, and largely contributed to make possible the world-war of 1914-18, which at least has made wise men wish that the mediæval power of the Popes had never been destroyed, and strive to find, if possible, a substitute for it. Probably not so many historians in the future will gloat over the fall of Boniface VIII., for they now realize that, unless some such power as his great predecessors possessed can be found, the end of European civilization is in sight.

² *Ib.*, c. 48. "Cum tamen regnorum unio non nisi per sedem ipsam fieri deberet ullo modo."

lands which they held in England. On the contrary, "by the Divine disposition, and the devotion of the faithful, and by the gift of Constantine the Great," Scotland passed to the Roman Church.¹ Later, England became tributary to the Roman Church, but Scotland was ever protected by it as its "peculiar allodial possession".² Moreover, the fact that Scottish civil appeals were made to it and not to the English King proves that the Apostolic see and not the King of England was the immediate superior of Scotland.³

If the English King had confidence in the justice of his cause, he would not decline the just judgment of the Roman Pontiff. Such a difficult case as the present could only be tried by a competent authority like the Holy See. But Edward had despised it, and the appeal the Scotch had made to it.⁴

Boniface
blames
Scottish
bishops,
1302.

These and many other points, developed at no little length, made a substantial memorial which was duly laid before Boniface.⁵ But, whether the Pope felt lost in the amount and in the mixture of fact and fiction which the two parties had put before him, or whether he was too deep in his struggle with Philip of France, at any rate he does not appear to have gone into the merits of the case, or to have attempted further to check Edward.

Unfortunately we do not know when the reply of the

¹ *Ib.*, c. 49-50 ff.

² "Regno Angliæ facto postea R. ecclesiæ notorie censuali . . . regnum Scotiæ, velut præcipuum et peculiare allodium ecclesiæ Romanæ . . . defensum fuisse legitur ab ipsa Romana ecclesia, etc." *Ib.*, c. 51.

³ *Ib.*, c. 54.

⁴ *Ib.*, c. 55.

⁵ The Scotch believed that:—

"Maystyre Baldred the Beset,

A wys clerk and a cunnand," had

"Awnsweryd to thai resowny welle," i.e., those of Edward, "And destroyid tham ilka dele." Wyntoun, *l.c.* Cf. *Cal. of Docs. relat. to Scot.*, ii, p. 375, n. 1341, and n. 1907.

Scotch to Edward's memorial was put into the Pope's hands. Perhaps he did not receive it till the close of 1302 or later. It is quite possible that he may never have seen it. Certainly he never even alludes to it.

We do know, however, not only that he received Edward's presentment of his case, but that he was much impressed by it. Writing to his master, one of our King's agents, a certain Thomas Wale, tells him that he reached the papal court at Anagni on the Sunday after St. Peter's Day (1301), and, as he had been commanded, presented Edward's memorandum to the Pope without delay. Next day Boniface sent for him, and told him that the reading of the King's courteous and plain statement of his right to Scotland "had done his heart good". He then made friar William of Gainsborough¹ again rehearse the matter before him, and said that the King had done well to trust him, as he could now save the lordship of Scotland for the English Crown. He further told the envoy openly before many (as he had indeed already done) that, of all those who wore a crown, Edward was the one he loved most²; and that, if the letter told the truth, as he believed it did, then no one could oust the King from the Signory of Scotland.

As some supposed that in the papal registers there was matter of importance to the King, the envoy had begged friar William, who was more in touch with the Curia than he was, to get him a look at them, and in three places he had found valuable material. Shown to the cardinals, it was declared by all to be sufficient.

His original copy, duly sealed, the envoy added that he would keep, as, for fear of loss, he dare not trust it to anyone. But he will send a transcript to the King.

¹ On him see *supra*, p. 235.

² "Qe vous fustes le homme du mond qe portast coroune qil plus ama." The document is in Norman French.

The Pope had told him that the King's affairs could not be furthered till he had laid them before a Consistory, and, as weakness often prevented him from attending to business, he advised the envoy to return home, and leave friar William to represent the King.¹

As for the Scotch memorandum, Boniface, at any rate up to the middle of August, 1302, had seemingly no knowledge of it. For, at the time named, evidently under the influence of Edward's memorandum, he addressed two letters, one to the Scotch bishops in general, and one to Wishart, bishop of Glasgow, in particular, blaming them for being, according to common report, the principal cause of the wars between the Scotch and "his most beloved son in Christ, the illustrious King Edward". By these wars, declared Boniface, souls and bodies are injured, and the cause of the Holy Land ruined. He accordingly exhorted the bishops so to work for peace as to win his praise, and not to deserve "a remedy".²

Unable to obtain help from the Pope, and abandoned by Philip of France, the Scotch had to rely upon themselves. For the moment they could not resist the might of Edward. Their country was completely subdued by him (1303-5), and Wallace, their heroic leader, was executed. But the Scots were soon in arms again, and death overtook our ambitious King (1307), ere he could master them once more.

Whatever other qualities archbishop Winchelsey had

Trouble for
Winchelsey
over
Pagham.

¹ J. Bain, *Cal. of Docs. relating to Scotland*, ii, p. 296-7, R. S., and is taken from *Chancery Miscellaneous Portfolios*, and is endorsed "Anglie mense Octobris," no doubt because received in England in October, 1301.

² Theiner, *Mon. Hibern.*, n. 371, Aug. 13, 1301. The bishop of Glasgow was a special "stone of offence and a rock of scandal" and deserved a letter of blame because he had taken an oath of fealty to Edward. *Ib.*, n. 372; or ap. *Cal. P. L.*, i, 602-3. Cf. Tytler, *Hist. of Scotland*, i, 167.

or had not, he was not destitute of courage in the performance of what he believed to be his duty. To obey the Pope's injunctions he had not feared to offend the King. When he believed that the defence of his rights required it, he was ready to oppose both the Pope and the King together. During the vacancy of the see of Canterbury, Edward had bestowed upon Theobald, the brother of his son-in-law, the count of Bar, the living of Pagham in Sussex, the patronage of which belonged to the archbishop of Canterbury. To ensure the success of his usurpation, the King had got Pope Boniface also to appoint Theobald by papal provision (July 8, 1297).¹

These appointments notwithstanding, the archbishop, seeing the rights of his see thus summarily set at naught, deprived Theobald of the living without further ado, taking advantage of a geographical error in the King's letter of nomination. Boniface, however, supplying any original defects, reappointed Theobald and ordered the removal of the nominee of the archbishop.² Winchelsey, however, stood by his nominee, and in consequence, "by the authority of the lord abbot of St. Michael's in the diocese of Verdun, he was denounced as excommunicated in all the churches of London (Oct. 31, 1301)." ³ The said abbot had obtained this authority from the bull of Boniface by which he had been ordered to induct Theobald into the living of Pagham.⁴ There was now nothing to be done but to submit. The archbishop withdrew his candidate from the living, and, on the showing of his own Register,⁵ appealed to the Pope for absolution from the sentence pronounced against him.

¹ *Cal. of P. L.*, i, p. 572.

² *Ib.*, p. 591, Jan. 15, 1301, or *Reg.*, n. 3856.

³ *Annal. London.*, i, pp. 102-3, *R. S.*

⁴ *Cal. of P. L.*, *l.c.*

⁵ Now (1927) in course of publication by Miss Rose Graham for *The Canterbury and York Society*.

IRELAND.

The see of
Dublin,
1295.

There is nothing really special or interesting with regard to the relations between Boniface and the Church in Ireland. Such as they are, they merely concern ordinary matters of church government, and are exactly parallel with those in England, as an example or two will demonstrate.

On the death of John de Sandford (Oct., 1294), the chapters of Christ Church and St. Patrick's elected, first irregularly and then regularly, Thomas of Chadsworth, dean of the latter chapter, to replace him. King Edward accepted the election, and on July 6, 1295, recommended it to the Pope for confirmation. At the same time, he begged him to excuse Thomas' going in person for this confirmation for certain reasons which the bishop's proctors will explain by word of mouth.¹ Boniface, however, decided that the reasons were frivolous, and, as the dean failed to put in an appearance in due time, he cancelled his election on that and "many other reasonable grounds". Then, "by the advice of his brethren, and the plenitude of the apostolic power," he appointed to the vacant see William de Hotham, provincial of the Dominicans in England, a man often employed by King Edward on diplomatic missions, and said by the Pope to be as conspicuous for his learning and piety as for his knowledge of affairs.² Somewhat over a year later, he bade the bishops of London and Hereford confer the pallium on the new archbishop.³

¹ *Cal. of Close Rolls*, 1288-96, p. 446. He wrote to two cardinals at the same time, asking them to use their influence in behalf of his request.

² Ep. to Will. of H., Apr. 24, 1296, ap. Theiner, *Mon. Hib.*, n. 352. Similar letters to the Chapters of Dublin, King Edward, etc., stating: "provisionem ejusdem Dublinensis ecclesie hac vice sedi apostolice reservantes."

³ *Ib.*, n. 358, July 8, 1297. Other cognate docs. on the same, p. 163. See J. d'Alton, *The Memoirs of the Archbops. of D.*, p. 110 ff., and

Unfortunately, William did not long survive his appointment. By his diplomatic work in connection with the peace negotiations between England and France, he fully justified the praise bestowed upon him by the Pope for his skill in dealing with men. This able and learned prelate died on August 27, 1298, and there ensued on his death a double election (Jan. 21, 1299). The monks of Christ Church chose their prior, Adam de Balsham, while the Chapter of St. Patrick's again chose Thomas of Chadsworth. Thereupon both candidates with some of the canonical electors went to the Pope, and ultimately both of them resigned their claims into his hands. Then, by his permission, the two of them with the canons who had come with them, elected Richard de Feringes, archdeacon of Canterbury. Boniface approved of their election as he had a high opinion of Richard's virtue and talents. Of these he spoke in the bull by which he definitely appointed him to the see of Dublin, and ordered Matthew of Acquasparta, cardinal-bishop of Porto, to consecrate him, and along with three other cardinals to give him the pallium (July 1, 1299).¹

In this bull Boniface again used the phrase about committing to him the administration of the see "in spirituals and in temporals".² As the phrase was certainly ambiguous, King Edward again took exception to it, and would not grant Richard the temporalities of the see until he had made a public declaration that he had no intention of trying to draw therefrom anything prejudicial to the rights of the crown.³

especially M. H. MacInerney, *A Hist. of the Irish Dominicans*, p. 378 ff. He was one of the envoys whom Edward used in the negotiations for peace between himself and Philip. Cf. Rishanger, p. 179; Trivet, p. 364.

¹ Theiner, *l.c.*, n. 366; *Cal. of P. L.*, p. 583. Cf. *ib.*, pp. 566 and 580.

² "Curam et administrationem ipsius (the see) tibi in spiritualibus et temporalibus committentes." ³ D'Alton, *l.c.*, p. 114.

Robert of
Clonfert.

The letters addressed by Pope Boniface to the Benedictine bishop of Clonfert are interesting from various points of view. Indults granting him permission to licence priests "to reconcile" churches and cemeteries, and to visit by deputy places in his diocese to which with safety he could not go himself,¹ would seem to prove that there was no little violent disorder in his diocese. He was also permitted in celebrating office to follow the rite of Clonfert, instead of that of Canterbury or of his Order, and despite any regulation of his Order to the contrary, to wear a rochet.²

The
bishopric of
Elphin and
the archbp.
of Tuam,
1300.

One more instance of a disputed election may be given because the Register of Boniface not only enables us to correct certain Irish Annals regarding it, but to realize how much certain prelates stood in need of a strong superior. On the death of Gelasius,³ bishop of Elphin (1296), it appears that the Dominican Marian O'Donnaiver was duly elected to succeed him. But as the overbearing archbishop of Tuam, William de Bermingham, refused to confirm him, he went to plead his case before the Pope. The archbishop for money, so it was said, had given his support to Malachy MacBrian, abbot of Boyle, who was elected subsequently to O'Donnaiver. Marian won his case at Rome, but died on his return journey (1297).⁴ Meanwhile, says Pope Boniface, in contempt of the Apostolic see, as he was not ignorant that it had recognized the election of Marian, he simoniacally intruded the abbot of Boyle into the

¹ *C. P. L.*, i, p. 565.

² *Ib.*, pp. 565-6; Theiner, *l.c.*, pp. 158-9, 162, 172.

³ His proper name was Gilla-Isa Mac-an-Liathanaigh. MacInerny, *l.c.*, p. 478.

⁴ Ep. of July 20, 1303, "Ad reformandos," ap. Theiner, *l.c.*, n. 373; *C. P. L.*, p. 610. This document corrects the mistakes of the *Annals of the Four Masters*, ed. O'Donovan, p. 467, and the *Annals of Loch Cé*, i, p. 527, which is the source of the *Four Masters*. The date of the death of Marian comes from the *Annals of Ulster*, an. 1297, vol. ii, p. 391, *R. S.*

diocese of Elphin, which, adds the Pope, he still holds. For this conduct and because he is said to have seized and plundered the church of Annadown, and the bishopric of Mayo, and to consort with murderers of clerks and other excommunicated persons, and though excommunicated himself to continue to celebrate divine services, —for all these reasons, Boniface ordered the bishops of Limerick, Killaloe, and Kilfenóra to meet and look into the whole state of affairs.

Of the ultimate issue of this case we know nothing, but there would appear to be evidence enough to make it seem probable that the charges brought against the archbishop of Tuam were in the main well founded. The man whom he had simoniacally intruded into the see of Elphin died in 1303, probably in February.¹

¹ See MacInerny, *l.c.*, chap. xi.

CHAPTER VIII.

BONIFACE VIII. AND FRANCE. ENGLAND AND FLANDERS.

France and
England,
1293-1303.

WHEN Boniface began his pontificate, France and England were actually at war, and throughout nearly the whole of it political relations between the two countries were always most strained. They remained so for the best of all reasons—the resolve of one of the parties concerned that they should be. Philip the Fair of France, or the gang of lawyers of whom, as many believe, he was but the tool, was resolved to get the English out of Gascony. He had, accordingly, quietly encouraged an “unofficial” piratical warfare which involved English and Gascons, Normans, Flemings, and even Dutchmen, and took advantage of many of these piratical doings frequently to summon Edward to appear before him as his liege-lord for Gascony. These citations Edward was not prepared to obey, and entered into negotiations to avoid having to do so. In them he was tricked, and woke up to the fact that something worse than chicanery had deprived him of Gascony (1294). He was furious, and at once began to make every preparation for war. His ambassadors tried to win over to his cause Adolf, King of the Romans, James II. of Aragon, John, duke of Brabant and others, and to keep Guy of Flanders from a French alliance, offered his son Edward to the count’s daughter, Philippina. To obtain ready money, he seized the merchants’ wool, and exacted unreasonable sums from the clergy.

Meanwhile Philip had not been idle.¹ Raising money

¹ On these alliances of Edward and of Philip, see the document published by Funck-Brentano in *Revue Historique*, 1889, p. 329 f.

as arbitrarily as Edward had done in England, he sent troops to meet those whom Edward had sent to recover Gascony, and on his side looked about for allies. Whether or not he had anything to do with the Welsh rising in September, 1294, which prevented Edward himself from sailing to Gascony, he was in negotiation with the Scottish King, Baliol, tired of Edward's domination, at the very time of the conclusion of the Welsh war (July, 1295).¹

When, therefore, Boniface became Pope, England and France were not only actually at war, but their quarrel threatened to involve the Empire, and nearly every Western nation. As the recognized head and guardian of the interests of Christendom, Boniface was at once deeply impressed by the gravity of the situation.² But, as he explained to King Edward, the dangers of the roads made his journey from Naples to Rome slow, and the solemnities of his consecration had taken time. At length, however, he was able to act; and, as he said, he was the more urged to do so from the esteem and affection which our King and he had long felt for each other. For this reason, he was desirous that Edward's name should be great among the Princes of the earth, and especially that war between himself and the King of France should cease. It was fatal to the cause of the Holy Land and highly displeasing to God. Wherefore, as he wrote to Edward, he was sending to the King of France and to him, Berard, cardinal-bishop of Albano, and Simon of Palestrina, men of prudence, virtue, and learning, lovers of peace,

Boniface
attempts to
make peace,
1295.

The document consists of a series of notes on the war against England drawn up at the end of the thirteenth cent. Both kings sent money to their allies.

¹ Cf. Walter of Hemingburgh, vol. ii, pp. 78-89.

² Touchingly did he write to Edward: "*Anxiamur ut pater, sauciamur ut mater, in intimis turbamur amarius ut amator . . . donec prælibatum negotium optatum et celerem exitum, juxta nostri cordis desiderium, sortiatur.*" *Reg.*, Feb. 19, 1295, n. 698.

pillars of the Church, and devoted to his honour. He, therefore, begged Edward to receive them well, and listen carefully to what they had to say in the cause of peace.¹ A similar letter was written to the King of France, and, at the same time, he dispatched letters to the count of Artois, to the Queen of France, and indeed to every important person who could help to bring about peace. All were earnestly exhorted to work hard in the sacred cause.²

Edward's
eagerness for
papal inter-
vention,
1295.

Had the Kings really wanted peace, the great efforts of Boniface would have been crowned with immediate success. Neither of them, however, desired a permanent peace, but both of them were anxious to use Boniface for their own ends as far as they could. Accordingly, as Edward was at the moment in straits, for the Welsh rising was preventing him from fighting in person for the recovery of Gascony, out of which he had been cheated by Philip, he was anxious for papal help. He, therefore, from Wales wrote to cardinal Acquasparta and other cardinals whom he knew to be well disposed to himself, to assure them that he was disposed to an honourable peace with France, and to commend his affairs to them, inasmuch as "they are", he said, "more arduous than heretofore."³ He wrote, also, specially to cardinal Berard, to tell him how glad he was that he had been selected to come to England, and to impress upon him

¹ *Ib.* See also his letter, Feb. 18, n. 697, to the two cardinals themselves. He tells them that it was the one wish of his heart that peace and concord should reign among all Christian princes. He gives them (see the foll. letters) full legatine powers.

² *Cf. Reg.*, nn. 697-732, Feb. 18-20.

³ *Cal. of Close letters*, 1288-96, p. 442, Apr. 6. Among others whom he used to push on the cause of peace between himself and Philip, was John of Pontissara, bishop of Winchester, whom the Pope had summoned to Rome on business of the Holy See. *Cf. Reg. of J. de P.*, ii, p. 778. Ep. of Dec. 17, 1295. *Cf. ib.*, pp. 768, 802-3. See also *Opus Chronicorum*, p. 58; *Gervase Cant. contin.*, ii, p. 311 f., *R. S.*

that his coming " would be very grateful and acceptable to him ".¹

The two cardinals went first to France on their errand of peace, and in the early part of May had an interview with Philip.² They reached England about May 22, but had to wait for the return of the King from Wales till the beginning of August.³ What sort of a reception they had met with from Philip we are not told ; but one of our chroniclers states that they found our King open to reason (*satis tractabilem*).⁴ In order that the negotiations might proceed the more rapidly, the cardinals first asked for a truce by land and sea. To this request Edward consented at once ; and, as he told the Pope, " because he wished devoutly to obey our Mother the Roman Church, and to show honour to the two cardinals," he offered, if Philip would do likewise, to agree to a truce till Nov. 1, 1295.⁵ So far successful, the cardinals returned to Philip (about Sept. 8), who promised an answer as soon as he had consulted his advisers.⁶ But, relying on the Scotch to keep Edward employed, Philip showed a decided unwillingness to treat. It is true that we are told that his answer was only made known to Edward himself, but the annalist significantly adds : " There was no hope of peace between them." ⁷ He was right.

The cardinals visit France and England to no purpose, 1295.

¹ *Ib.*, Apr. 28, p. 444 (*cf.* ep. of June 7, p. 445), or Rymer, ii, 679.

² Will. of Nangis, i, 289.

³ Rishanger, p. 150.

⁴ *Ann. de Dunstap.*, p. 396.

⁵ Ep. of Aug. 14, Rymer, ii, 685. *Cf.* the following letters in which he tells his allies of the truce, and bids all his subjects in the matter of cessation of hostilities, to obey the cardinals as himself. He also begged the cardinals (*ib.*, p. 687) to try to obtain from Philip the release of the English and Gascon hostages. The contin. of Florence of Worcester (ad an. 1295) shows that " parliament was behind the King's answer ".

⁶ Rishanger, and *Ann. de D.*, ll.cc.

⁷ *Ann. de D.*, p. 397.

Philip, immediately after he had given his reply, which was only delivered after November 1, sent troops against "all who favoured the King of England". Edward, thereupon, called upon "his whole realm, English, Welsh, Irish, and Scotch" to get ready to start with him "to put down the pride and injustice of the French".¹

At this moment, one of the chief obstacles to peace was Edward's ally, the King of the Romans. Trouble between England and France was his opportunity for establishing his power. He, accordingly, showed no disposition to peace, and, as we have already seen, added greatly to the difficulties in the way of peace which at this period Boniface was working so hard to overcome.²

Fresh efforts
to 1297.

Neither the Pope, however, nor the cardinals, were disheartened at this first failure; but they were destined to work for two more years before they could even gain a truce. However, the two legates began at once to make fresh proposals,³ and in March, 1296, cardinal Berard de Got returned to England. As Edward had gone north against the Scots, the cardinal followed him, and had an interview with him at Berwick, where he had his headquarters during nearly all the month of April (1296). Nothing much, however, could be done, as Edward declared that his ally the King of the Romans would not consent to a truce. Still, he empowered the cardinals to negotiate for a temporary truce till Christmas⁴; so that,

¹ *Ib.* Philip felt perfectly secure because he had on Oct. 23 renewed his offensive and defensive alliance with the Scotch. See the treaty in Rymer, ii, 695.

² *Cf. supra*, p. 116 ff.

³ See Edward's letter to the cards. of Nov. 17, 1295, ap. Rymer, ii, 698.

⁴ *Cf.* a series of letters of Edward directed to the cardinals and his officials, and dated from Berwick, Apr. 24, 1296, *ib.*, ii, 708 ff. He consented to this as he said "out of reverence for the Apostolic See and at the repeated requests of the venerable Father Berard, lord bishop of Albano, cardinal of the Holy Roman Church and our friend". *Ib.*,

disappointed once more, the cardinal of Albano returned to France to try Philip again (June).¹

While one of his legates was posting full speed to the north of England, Boniface thought of attempting, by apostolic authority, to impose a two years' truce on the King of the Romans and the Kings of England and France. In a "close" letter to the two cardinals, he tells them how full of compassion he is for them in the toils and anxieties they are enduring in their work for peace. How glad he would be if the Kings would choose arbitrators by whom their discords could be settled²; and he would return thanks to God if they themselves could in any way bring them to concord. However, should they think it necessary he would come in person; but that should be the last resort as his health was not such that he could easily face crossing the Alps, deep valleys, and precipitous mountains. Nor were the roads very safe for the passage of the papal court; nor again, in the present state of Sicily, was it desirable for the Pope to be far away. Still, as he had said before, if no other way can be found, and it seems desirable to the parties concerned and to them, he will come.

However, by a final letter he authorized the cardinals

709, Edward notified the King of the Romans that he granted this power to card. Berard, "nostre chere amy," out of regard to the honour of the Church of Rome which can be of great use to us in our present needs: "pur l'onur de la dite Eglise de Rome la quele a vous e a nous . . . porra estre en cette bosoigne mout profitable." Ep., May 16, Rymer, ii, 715-16.

¹ Rishanger, p. 166. "Intentione sua in hac parte frustratus." Cf. *Flores Hist.*, iii, 96, and the Eton MS. apud *ib.*, iii, 287.

² "Sane si dicti principes vellent arbitros, arbitratores seu amicabiles compositores eligere, per quos eorum discordia sedaretur, hoc nostris gratum affectibus proveniret." *Reg.*, n. 1585, Apr. 16, 1296. In the *Cal. of P.L.*, i, 567, this letter is wrongly assigned to Apr. 20. Those modern historians who assert that Boniface was always trying to force his own mediation on the Kings should note this passage.

not to impose the truce if they saw that the Kings were of their own accord disposed to come to terms.¹

A fresh
meeting to
be held at
Cambrai,
1296.

The cardinals did not attempt to impose the Pope's truce, for though they had to report that the King of England would not be a party to any truce to which the King of the Romans did not give his consent, they were also able to report that they had been able to reopen serious negotiations for peace, and that it had been agreed to hold a meeting at Cambrai in October, at which envoys from the King of the Romans were to be present. The Kings of England and France had also agreed to send envoys to the Pope to treat of peace. It was on this point that the cardinals wanted their master's views.²

In his reply, Boniface expressed his sorrow that his sons had not accepted his recommendations as the healing draughts of a doctor, but even in a sense seemed to be displeased that he was drawing them to health. However, as there appeared to be no quicker way to peace, then, for the public good of Christendom, let the envoys be sent in all speed.³ At the same time, for the dignity of the Holy See, he wished his truce to be imposed in the event of any change of plan.⁴ By the same carrier, he sent letters to Philip, asking him to see that the envoys he selected were men who were at once honourable, ready to be guided by truth and right reason, and fully instructed.⁵ Further, for the advantage of his realm, he begged him to send to him his brother, Charles of Valois (or of Alençon), to whom he wished to impart a scheme he had in his mind.⁶

¹ *Reg.*, n. 1584, Apr. 17, 1296.

² *Reg.*, n. 1642, Aug. 18, 1296.

³ *Ib.*

⁴ *Reg.*, n. 1643, Aug. 18, 1296.

⁵ *Reg.*, n. 1645, same date.

⁶ *Reg.*, n. 1646, of the same date. The scheme may have been the ultimate advancement of Charles to the Empire.

The result of these conferences was, of course, the production of a draft of a fresh treaty of peace, but nothing tangible resulted from them. So that Edward had to declare to the archbishop of Canterbury, not only in August, 1296,¹ that the King of France had not consented to a treaty of peace or even to a truce, but also in August, 1297. Writing to Robert Winchelsey in that month (Aug. 16), he begged him to order prayers throughout his province for the King, as he was going "to parts beyond the sea to defend his friends and confederates against the attacks of the King of France who . . . has lately refused to assent to a treaty of peace or rather a truce of two years to be imposed by the Pope's authority, put forth by the Bishops of Albano and Palestrina, to which he himself had given his consent".²

Only a few days after the dispatch of this letter, Boniface wrote to tell Edward that the work and worry which his two legates had had in connection with these peace negotiations had been their death. He had written to bid them come and report to him on the situation. One had died on the way, and the bishop of Palestrina a few days after he had reached the Pope. However, before they started on their journey, they had drawn up a detailed report of all they had done; and from it and the words of bishop Simon shortly before he died, Boniface had been able to judge with what prudence and earnestness they had done their work. He then informed Edward that he was sending in their stead the Master-General of the Dominicans, Nicholas Boccasini (afterwards Benedict XI.), and John de Murro (afterwards cardinal),

Philip will not accept a truce, 1297.

Death of the two legates, 1297.

¹ *Cal. of Close Rolls* (1288-96), p. 513. Of course, by Aug. 26, 1296, there had not been time for anything to be done.

² *Cal. of Close R.* (1296-1302), p. 124. See the letter of the cardinals of Apr. 19, 1297, containing the haughty refusal of Philip to allow the Pope to interfere in any way in the temporal concerns of his country, ap. Dupuy, *Hist. du différend de B. VIII., etc.*, p. 27.

Minister-General of the Franciscans, men of great discretion, and begged him in view of the harm which the war was doing to all Christians, especially to those in the Holy Land, to send to him envoys "lovers of peace", and furnished with all the necessary powers for a fresh effort to make a treaty.¹

Armistice
and truce
between
England and
France,
1297.

The magnificent zeal of Boniface in the cause of peace was at last to be rewarded. Edward's successes in Scotland, and his appearance in Flanders to help its count, made Philip more ready to negotiate. An armistice, or what Edward calls a "souffraunce de guerre", for a month or so was agreed to in October,² and on November 23, was prolonged till the Lent of 1298,³ and then to the feast of the Epiphany (Jan. 6), 1299.⁴

The war, says one of our chroniclers, "was put in sufferance until the Pope has made order and provided the accord between the two Kings . . . clerks and laymen in whom the Kings have trust are gone to Rome with letters of credence."⁵

English
envoys sent
to the Pope,
1298.

The chronicler spoke the truth. On February 18, 1298, Edward sent to the Pope William Hotham, archbishop of Dublin, Otho de Grandison, and other "clerks and laymen" with power to treat for peace. They were sent, said the King, because he was convinced that the best

¹ Rymer, ii, 791 ff. Ep. of Aug. 25.

² *Ib.*, 795 ff.

³ *Ib.*, 799 ff.

⁴ And then again to the Epiphany of 1300. *Ib.*, 849 ff. Cf. *Cal. of C. R.* (1296-1302), p. 196, and *Ann. Gandenses*, ap. *M. G. SS.*, xvi, p. 562. These same annals of Ghent state that count Guy agreed to the armistice on condition that Edward swore not to make peace with the King of France till he had recovered all the territory he had lost. The Annals contend that Edward did not keep his oath, but *was said* to have been absolved by the Pope from the obligation of keeping it. The papal nuncios reached England on the Feast of the Holy Innocents. Cf. Rishanger, p. 183.

⁵ Pierre de Langtoft, *Chron.*, p. 309, *R. S.* Cf. Rymer (Record ed.), i, 885, Jan. 29, 1298.

way "to soothe trouble between sons at discord was the ever-watchful solicitude of the father".¹ In other letters, he solemnly promised to abide by the Pope's award if he would only safeguard his obligations to his allies.²

Similar declarations were made by Philip of France. Like his predecessors, he declared, he was devoted to his mother the Holy Roman Church; and his filial reverence urged him to comply with her wishes as far as possible. In accordance, therefore, with them, and on account of his reverence for the said Church and his special affection for Pope Boniface, he was sending to him as plenipotentiaries to treat of peace with Edward, the archbishop of Narbonne, the duke of Burgundy, the famous or infamous Pierre Flotte and others. To what they agreed in his name, he would accept.³

It will have been observed that in all the official documents which we have just cited, there is no allusion to Boniface except as "Supreme Pontiff". Suddenly, however, when announcing to the world that "his immense labours" in the cause of peace have been crowned with success, for the plenipotentiaries of England, France, and Flanders have arrived in Rome, he stated that they had all agreed to submit to his arbitration "as a private person, as Benedict Gaetani".⁴

¹ Rymer, i, p. 808. Cf. Edward's letters to his friends in the College of Cardinals, *ib.*, 808-9, in which he states that he has always held that "negotium . . . guerrarum quæ sunt inter Regem Franciæ et nos coram SS. Patre D. Bonifacio nunc summo Pontifice, tractetur, et (si fieri potest) reformatur".

² *Ib.*, 809-11, Feb. 18, 1298.

³ Rymer, ii, 812 f., March 4, 1298. It is Philip the Fair who said he acted: "Ob . . . specialis quam ad eundem summum Pontificem gerimus dilectionis affectum."

⁴ They agreed "de . . . expreso consensu . . . arbitrio nostri, tamquam privatæ personæ ac Benedicti Gaetani . . . se submittere". *Ib.*, p. 817 f., June 30, 1298. By some strange oversight the *Cal. of Papal Letters*, i, p. 579, etc., speaks of the arbitration of the Pope

Philip of France also sends plenipotentiaries to the Pope, 1298.

Boniface to arbitrate "as a private person", as Benedict Gaetani.

What then had happened in the meanwhile? Certainly no difficulties had been raised by the Burgundians whose agreement to submit to the Pope's decision was made in Rome after that of England and France.¹ Nor can it be that the new idea that the Pope should only act as a private person was due to any strong views expressed by the Flemings of whom something must now be said.

The count of Flanders, the weak and rather incapable Guy Dampierre, had by King Philip of France been treacherously kept in confinement, whence he had only been released after he had surrendered to his enemy his daughter, Philippina. To avenge himself for the cruel treatment he had received at the hands of Philip, he had thrown off all allegiance which he owed to the French King.² He had then, as we have seen, made an alliance with Edward (Jan. 7, 1297),³ and had arranged to give his daughter, Isabella, in marriage to Prince Edward.⁴ At the same time, he appealed also for papal protection against his powerful and unscrupulous foe.⁵

"assisted by B. G." Also the dates on that page are wrong. In place of the *Ides* of July, one should read the Kalends, i.e., June 30, and not July 14. *Reg.*, n. 2810. Cf. a letter of Philip the Fair, ap. Dupuy, *Hist. du diff.*, p. 84.

¹ They sent their officials "devant le Seint Pere en Dieu, notre Seigneur, Sire Boniface de la Saint Eglise de Rome et de la Universale Eglise, Souverain Evesque"; and their "submission" was made "a Saint Pere en Paleys du Pape". Rymer, ii, 814 f., Apr. 20, 1298.

² Will. of Nangis, i, p. 296.

³ Rymer, ii, 737 ff. Cf. *Flores Hist.*, iii, 98-9, R. S.

⁴ Rymer, ii, 741-2.

⁵ See the documents cited by K. de Lettenhove, *Hist. de Flandre*, ii, p. 392. The fourteenth century *Chronique Normande* (p. 2), ed. Molinier, and the perhaps still later *Chronographia Regum Francorum* (i, p. 53), ed. Moranville, tell of this appeal and of a curt answer of Philip to the Pope. But their authority, as late, is of no great weight. A much superior authority is Gilles le Muisit, *Chron.*, pp. 50-1, G., b. c. 1271, † 1352. See also *Annales Gandavenses*, ap. M. G. SS., xvi, 592-3, and their author's outburst against Philip's advisers and his conduct with regard to Philippina.

Guy's envoy, his chaplain, Michel Asclokettes, was able to report to his master that the Pope had given a very gracious hearing to his request, and had assured him that, as he had been made the arbitrator on the quarrel between France and England, he hoped to arrange matters favourably for count Guy also. The envoy impressed upon the count that he must be well provided with money, as his adversaries had many partisans, and the Roman curia was very grasping.¹

Returning then to the question as to the origin of the idea that Boniface should act as a private person, we can only conclude that it came from the envoys of France or England or of both when they got to Rome.² In the interests of peace the Pope was only too ready to waive any question of his own dignity and generally recognized position; and, as we have said, he proclaimed to the world that he was arbitrating as Benedict Gaetani.

In this capacity he gave his final award touching "perpetual peace" between England and France on June 27, 1298.³ Marriages were the principal conditions of this peace. King Edward was to marry Margaret, the sister of Philip, and to give her a dowry of fifteen thousand pounds of Tours; and, when the parties were old enough,

The award of Pope Boniface, 1298, June 27-30.

¹ "Et, sir, savoir devés que li cours de Romme est moult désirans." Cf. the letter of M. Asclokettes from the Archives of Lille which K. de L., *l.c.*, gives in full, p. 579 ff. The giving of presents and pensions to the cardinals was the order of the day; but a document given by the same author, p. 589 ff., shows that money had to be given to members of their households in order that the petitioner might have access to their masters ("pro familia cardinalium prædictorum 3 florenos per quam habui sæpe accessum"). The same applied to the papal servitors: "Item. pro hostiariis papæ X turonenses grossos per quos habui sæpe accessum ad papam." On one occasion there is mention of a gift of 1,003 florins to the Pope "to keep his friendship, and to render him more well disposed to the cause". P. 598.

² Cf. Rishanger, p. 184.

³ *Ib.*, p. 189; *Gesta Ed. I.*, p. 417; *Flores Hist.*, iii, 104-5; N. Trivet, pp. 374-5; *Ann. Ang. et Scot.*, pp. 388-9, 390, etc.

Prince Edward was to marry Isabella, Philip's daughter, and to give her a dowry of eighteen thousand pounds of Tours. There was to be a mutual restoration of territory and property seized since the war, and losses were to be made good. If the parties cannot agree as to the amount of compensation due, the Pope will settle the amount. The King of England was to have those lands (Gascony) in the Kingdom of France which he and his father before him had held. He was to pay due homage for them. Pending the mutual restoration of lands, castles, etc., whether at the moment in the hands of the King of France or of England, they were to be placed under the Pope's control, so that the state of things before the war might be restored.

This treaty of peace was signed "in the Papal palace at St. Peter's in a great consistory held in the Great Hall in the presence of a large number of people and cardinals", and it was duly published three days later (June 30).¹

The Pope's
award
accepted by
Parliament,
1299.

The Pope's award was duly submitted by Edward to a Parliament which was held at Westminster (May 3, 1299). It is interesting to note that "for the literate" it was read in Latin, and in English "for the illiterate". Our chronicler who tells us of the doings of this Parliament gives but a brief summary of the award. He begins by stating that the Pope declared he was ready to suffer loss of health and resources rather than that the dreadful war between England and France should continue; and he sums up the conditions of peace in the two marriages, and in Philip's re-ensfeoffing Edward with Gascony.²

¹ Rymer, ii, 819 ff. Philip or his advisers were very discontented at the award, and only finally accepted it on Aug. 3, 1299, at Montreuil. Cf. Rymer, ii, 851 ff.

² "Quod Rex Franciæ . . . refeoffaret Regem Angliæ . . . Wasconiam." *Annales Angliæ et Scotiæ*, p. 389, printed with Rishanger, R. S.

When the document had been read and explained, the King asked the assembly what they thought of it. After a brief consultation "all (the nobles) replied with one accord: 'The advice, O King! which you ask of us has been firmly given by the Supreme Pontiff. It is no business of ours to weaken what has been laid down and approved by the Vicar of Blessed Peter.'" ¹

To two ambitious kings who were striving to get all power into their hands, Boniface might be Benedict Gaetani; but to the people of England, represented by Parliament, he was the Pope, the successor of St. Peter.

As far as the treaty went, it was absolutely fair ²; but it was not altogether what Boniface would have wished. Philip of France was desirous of preventing the Flemings from benefiting by it, and Edward was just as determined with regard to the Scotch. For the greater good, therefore, Boniface had to leave those two peoples out of consideration. He, no doubt, had hopes of saving them in some other way. We know he tried to save the Scotch from Edward's clutches, by claiming Scotland as a dependence of the Roman Church.

What plan he had for saving the Flemings does not appear.³ Meanwhile he had to sacrifice them. On the

¹ "Mox d. Regi responderunt omnes una voce: Consilium quod a nobis exigitis, Domine Rex, firmatum et stabilitum est a summo Pontifice. Quod autem a Vicario b. Petri ordinatum et roboratum est, non est nostrum infirmare." *Ib.*, p. 390. According to our author, all "the wiser sort" both of clergy and laity were summoned to this parliament, and, if his memory served him properly, the award had only reached England on March 1, 1299.

² Cf. Hallam, *Europe during the Mid. Ages*, p. 385, n., ed. 1868. Cf. Boutaric, *La France, etc.*, p. 99, calls the award: "où tout est digne d'un pontife pacificateur." Those who would know more of the legal grounds of the decision of Boniface should read "Edward I.'s case against P. over Gascony" by H. Rothwell, ap. *The Eng. Hist. Rev.*, Oct., 1927, p. 572 ff.

³ The *Chron. RR.FF.*, i, p. 78, states that Philip would not accept an award favourable to the Flemings, but it does not say what the award was.

The
Flemings
and Scotch
sacrificed.

day that the treaty was published, Boniface issued a decree which set forth that, for the perfection of the treaty between France and England, and because no espousals or marriage contract had been entered into between Prince Edward and count Guy's daughter, all agreements in connection with that matter were annulled. This the Pope declared that he did in virtue of the power of arbitration which had been put into his hands, and in virtue of his apostolic authority.¹

Not unnaturally, the Flemings felt aggrieved. In the bitterness of his heart count Guy declared that all their troubles came from the Court of Rome. Abandoned by Edward, they knew that if the Pope failed them, they could not resist the French ; and so Guy impressed on his envoys the necessity of making known their difficulties to the cardinals on every opportunity.² It was to no purpose that the count's sons implored the Pope to be mindful of their misfortunes and their rights.³

Although Boniface did, indeed could do, nothing more for the time than advise the Flemings to submit to Philip,⁴ they did not cease to implore his protection. They finally appealed to him, no longer as the private arbitrator, Benedict Gaetani, but as Pope, who they

¹ *Ib.*, p. 818, June 30, 1298.

² See a letter of Guy printed in full by K. de L., *l.c.*, p. 582 f. "Sachiés que se li papes nos faut, nous sommes del tout au desous, car nul espoir nous n'avoms ès rois de Engleterre e d'Alemaigne." *Cf.* p. 413 f.

³ *Cf. ib.*, p. 583, for a letter they addressed to Boniface (June, 1298). *Cf.* p. 415 f. *Cf. Ann. Gandav.*, ap. de Smet, *Recueil de Chron. de Flandre*, i, pp. 377-8.

⁴ K. de L., *ib.*, pp. 417-18. To these negotiations we would refer a letter (Potthast, n. 25448, and *Reg. Bened. XI.*, n. 1327) written by a Pope to Guy's son, Robert, and tentatively referred to Benedict XI. The Pope tells of his labours to make peace between Philip and the Flemings, and of how he has urged Guy to be mindful of his old age, and not to try the chances of war, and he urges Robert to induce his father to listen to the sober advice of those who are counselling peace.

declared had supreme power both in the Church and in the State.¹ "The Pope," they said to him, "is the supreme judge of all, not merely in spiritual matters, but also, in the case of such as are subject to other secular judges, in matters temporal. For he is the Vicar of Christ, who is all powerful . . . and, as all power comes from God, so it is that all jurisdiction over both spiritual and temporal things has been confided to his Vicar. . . . That this full and complete power resides in the supreme Pontiff, no faithful can deny. Even the Emperor, the highest of secular Princes, is judged and even deposed by the Supreme Pontiff. The King of France, too, who, it is said, does not recognize any superior, can be (lit. *is*) judged and deposed for demerits. It is of the Roman Pontiff that it is said: 'I have set you over nations and over kingdoms' (Jer. i, 10), and so it behoves him to be judge of great and small alike. It is agreed that every oppressed man has a right of free appeal to the Roman see, and this is especially true when, in the case of either clerics or laymen, there is no other judge. Further, there cannot be the slightest doubt that the affair comes, at least indirectly, under the jurisdiction of the Pope, because it is wholly his business to correct where there is question of sin; and it is matter of public notoriety that the King of France has committed injuries against count Guy. The King, too, has denied the count of Flanders the right to be tried by his peers." ²

¹ K. de L. prints this most remarkable declaration presented to Boniface by the count's envoys. Dec. 29, 1299, p. 603 ff. Cf. p. 421 f. The preamble set forth how the K. of France had oppressed them, broken the truce, and was keeping the count's daughter in confinement.

² "Summus pontifex iudex est omnium in spiritualibus quam in temporalibus inter illos qui alios habent sæculares iudices." *Ib.*, p. 604. After this declaration, one is not surprised to hear that cardinal Acquasparta, in the presence of the Pope and cardinals, proclaimed the same doctrine in a sermon on the Epiphany of the year 1300. See a letter of the Flemish ambassadors cited by K. de L., *l.c.*, p. 422.

There is no need to cite any more of this appeal. It states in the most absolute form the theory of the Middle Ages as to the position of the bishop of Rome in Christendom. But there always have been rulers (and this truth has been conspicuous enough in our own times) who, in possession of might, have regarded it as the only right. If our own Edward was one such ruler, still more so was Philip the Fair, or the counsellors who spoke in his name. Of this Boniface was getting more and more proof every day. But he naturally and properly thought that, for the good of Christendom, peace between England and France was of the first importance, even if the rights of Flanders were to be part of the payment for it.

Guy basely
imprisoned
by Philip of
France,
1300.

For the time being the freedom of Flanders came to an end. Count Guy and a number of his nobles surrendered themselves to Charles of Valois, on the understanding that he would be responsible for their freedom after they had presented themselves to his brother to arrange for peace. But, false to all his engagements as to the truce,¹ devoid of every trace of chivalrous feeling, Philip, to the great indignation even of his own brother, Charles of Valois, basely threw the unfortunate count and his nobles into prison.²

This disgraceful action deeply moved Boniface, and, as we shall see in the next chapter, provoked him to issue the famous bull "Ausculda, fili", in which he ordered Philip to set Guy at liberty. The Pope's zeal

¹ See a letter of Guy's son Robert to the Flemish envoys in Rome, Jan., 1300, given in full by K. de L., *l.c.*, p. 587 f. We are, he wrote, in great danger "cum rex Franchie et sui contra prorogationem treugarum SS. Pontificis terram Flandrie intraverint . . . Dictus rex mandatis summi pontificis et Romanæ ecclesiæ inobediens est".

² Accordingly, the *Chronicle of the Counts of Flanders*, ap. De Smet, *Corpus*, i, p. 165, writes: "Carolus frater regis fuit indignatus contra regem . . . exivit præ indignationem Franciam . . . et moratus est cum Italicis multis temporibus, ibique in negotio ecclesiæ . . . viriliter eorum liberationem prosecutus est."

in the cause of justice and the good of others was to end in the tragedy of Anagni ; but Philip's treachery was to lead France into the Flemish ditches of Courtrai (1302).

Meanwhile Boniface had found that his "immense labours" to keep the English and French at peace were not over when he published his award, and Edward had discovered further proof that it was easier to get Philip of France to make promises than to fulfil them.

Difficulties in carrying out the award of Boniface.

To ensure the mutual restoration of conquered territories, Boniface decided that they were to be put under the control of Raynaldus, bishop of Vicenza, the one into whose hands Edward had consigned John Baliol.¹ With the consent of the Pope, the restoration question was settled by the simple expedient of each party retaining what it held at the time of the award.²

But other details of the award were not so easily arranged ; and, in despair of their settlement, Edward begged Boniface to come to France himself, and settle them on the spot. The Pope, however, while assuring Edward that he wished to see him for many reasons—the affairs of the Holy Land being one of them—declared that his great age and long-standing infirmities rendered such a journey impossible.³ Let the King send to him fully qualified and instructed envoys, and matters could quickly be adjusted.

Edward was anxious enough to clear up all his differences with France, not only on account of his

¹ Rymer, ii, pp. 835-6 (*cf.* letters of K. Edw., *ib.*, pp. 833-4), April 24, 1299. On his taking charge of J. B., *ib.*, pp. 840, 846.

² *Ib.*, July 29, 1299, ii, p. 850. Boniface took the opportunity of showing Edward how carefully he had watched over his interests by seeing that the custody of important places was placed in the hands of men favourable to him. He knew well that the partisans of Philip could not be trusted.

³ *Ib.*, pp. 859-60, Nov. 14, 1299. He begs the King to spare "patri jam ætate grandævo, jam circumvento senectutis incommodis, quem longa gravavit infirmitas".

troubles with Scotland, but because at this time his interest in the Holy Land was reawakened by the idea of an alliance with the Tartars.¹ Hence fresh envoys were sent to the Pope with full powers to do all that was necessary to complete the peace with France.²

The
interview at
Sculcula,
1300.

From a document found in the Public Record Office,³ we learn that these envoys, headed by John Pontoise, bishop of Winchester, had interviews with the Pope at Sculcula near Anagni (Aug. 21-4, 1300). Boniface opened the business by declaring his special love for Edward, for he had tried him and found him loyal,⁴ and then by showing all that he had done to preserve Edward's rights in Gascony. The English King ought to have trusted the Pope more. He knew how the French wanted Gascony, and how they were never willing to give up what once they had grasped. Whosoever had dealings with the French must be very wary, for to deal with them is to deal with the devil.⁵ He then went on to say that on one occasion, he had told some French envoys that they had already taken Normandy from the King of England, and that it seemed to be their intention to deprive him of all he had. "Thereupon," added the Pope, "Pierre Flotte laughed and said, 'Of a surety, Sire, you speak the truth.'"⁶

¹ See letters of Boniface regarding joint action with the Tartars against the infidel. Ep. of Apr. 7, 1300, ap. Rymer, ii, 862. Accordingly on March 12, 1303, Edward assured Gazan, the Persian Khan of the Tartars, that "when the Pope, with God's help, shall place him in such a condition that he can attend to the matter", he will do so. Cf. *Cal. of Close R.* (1302-7), vol. v, p. 77 ff., R. S.

² Ep. of E. to the Pope, Apr. 15, 1300, ap. *ib.*, ii, 864.

³ Published in the *Eng. Hist. Rev.*, 1902, p. 518 ff.

⁴ "Nous amoms mult le Roi Dangleterre qar nous lavoms esprovee et lavoms trovee loial." *Ib.*, p. 522.

⁵ "Doit mult prendre garde qi ad affaire od Franceis, qar qi ad affaire ove Fraunceis, ad affaire ove deable." *Ib.*, p. 523.

⁶ *Ib.*

He reminded the envoys that the Pope carried a two-edged sword, i.e., that he held both spiritual and temporal power, and that the latter power was twofold. He had not only the power of an arbitrator, but also the authority of the Apostle. In all this affair, he had never renounced the latter authority, and would use it when it seemed desirable. The English King, he said, had never acted wisely. Instead of asking us to treat of peace as an arbitrator, he should, as we advised him, have complained to us that the King of France was acting *wrongfully* by retaining Gascony. Matters would now, had he acted thus, have been in a very different state. The method of arbitration is useless with the French, as they will make impossible demands; and if we give a decision they would not accept it, nor would they mind the penalty attached to the non-acceptance of the arbitration. But if they were accused of the crime of holding the territories wrongfully, it would not avail them to say that we have no concern with lay fiefs, for this we have by reason of their sinful detention.¹

We have great affection for the King of England, but if we have never shown it, it is because the French are very suspicious, and if we had given any sign of being gracious to him, they would never have consented to our acting as arbitrator. For that same reason have we granted many favours to the King of France, and not one to the King of England.² Besides, he (Edward) ought not to have gone to Flanders where he had no rights,³ nor have allied himself with the Germans and Burgundians

¹ "Convendrait avoir procuracie a (pleindre) du roi de Fraunce et du peche qil fit de retenir sa terre atort." *Ib.*, p. 525.

² "Et pour ceo avoms nous fet au Roi de Fraunce mult de graces, et au Roi Dangleterre navoms fait nule." *Ib.*

³ Cf. the very same contention of the English barons to K. Edward, *Flores Hist.*, iii, 102; Rishanger, p. 175.

to wage war on France. It would have been quite another matter, if he had gone to Gascony to defend his own.

The King of France has certainly, continued the Pope, great need of our help both spiritually and temporally. Spiritually, because he is overwhelmed with sins of all kinds—with the robbing of churches, with outraging the rights of churchmen, etc. Temporally, because he has dissipated his revenues. Moreover, he had never kept the truce properly; nor can we understand how the prelates of France have granted him an aid against Flanders. We regard them and the King as excommunicated.¹

Great
defeat of
the French
at Courtrai,
1302.

The result of this conference, which does not appear to have led to much, was ordered by the Pope to be communicated to Edward by word of mouth.² Negotiations in connection with the peace and the sending of ambassadors to the Pope continued,³ Edward constantly begging the Pope "to show his usual care so to conclude the affair as to benefit *the whole Christian republic*".⁴ The negotiations would, no doubt, have continued till the death of Philip (for he had no intention of giving up his hold on Gascony), had not his affairs in Flanders gone badly. The overbearing treatment of the French drove the Flemings into successful rebellion, and the flower of the French chivalry perished in the concealed trenches

¹ "Le Roi de Fraunce nad mie garde les trewes qe nous avoms ordenes." *Ib.*, p. 526. The document is endorsed: "Reasons why the King should proceed against the King of France as guilty of *sin*."

² Ep. of Aug. 14, 1300, ap. Rymer, ii, 865.

³ Rymer, ii, pp. 867-8, 889-90, 895, etc. Edward sent his envoys that "the durable and firm peace . . . pronounced by the Pope shall be firmly held". See *Cal. of C. R.* (1302-7), vol. v, p. 65, *R. S.*

⁴ *Cal. of C. Rolls*, 1296-1302, pp. 503-4, Aug. 4, 1301. Cf. ep. of March 5, 1302, *ib.*, p. 580.

which the Flemings had dug for them before Courtrai (July, 1302).¹

According to the intemperate manifesto drawn up by Nogaret and William de Plaisan against Boniface, he not only expressed his satisfaction when the Flemings broke out into rebellion against Philip, but publicly rejoiced at the disaster of Courtrai.² We know, at any rate, from the reliable pages of Le Muisit that, when the Pope received letters about the battle (and it is said that he got them within seven days), he roused up the Flemish envoy, Asclokettes, at midnight, and showed them to him. "I know this," adds the chronicler, "from the envoy himself, as also that the Pope had a great liking for the Flemings."³

After the news of the Courtrai disaster had reached England, Edward sent fresh envoys to Philip to induce him to fulfil the Pope's award completely. But, putting a bold face on the matter, Philip declared that he would no longer accept the mediation of Benedict Gaetani,⁴ and replied to the envoys of the King of England that their master ought to come to him in his own person, and that then the final arrangements about the peace could be made. However, when this answer was received in England, it was regarded as an insult, and "the council of the whole kingdom decided positively that the King . . . should not leave England at the command or suggestion of the King of France (Oct. 13, 1302) "⁵

Peace at
last, 1303.

Philip, however, could not afford to play further with Edward. It is true that for a time longer he carried on

¹ "Flos militiæ Gallicanæ ceciderit." B. Guidonis, *vit. B.*, p. 672. On this battle, see F. Funck-Brentano, "La bataille Courtrai," ap. *L'Académie des inscript.*, vol. x, pt. i, 1891, p. 235 ff.

² *Hist. du diff.*, p. 341.

³ *Chron.*, ap. De Smet, *Corpus*, ii, p. 196.

⁴ Ep. of Nov. 8, 1302, ap. Dupuy, *Hist. du diff.*, p. 84.

⁵ *Flores Hist.*, iii, 111.

negotiations with the Scotch.¹ But he found that they were not powerful enough to be a match for Edward, although in that monarch's absence, they had recently captured Stirling castle (Feb. 18, 1303), and defeated the English at Roslin (Feb. 24). He was at the very height of his quarrel with Boniface, who, by acknowledging Albert's claim to the title of King of the Romans, had succeeded in detaching him from the French alliance.² Philip feared that the Pope might succeed in the attempt he was now making to induce Edward not to worry any more about the peace conditions, but to break off the endless negotiations about them, and to win back Gascony by force of arms.³ Accordingly, he agreed to additional prolongations of the truce,⁴ and at last, May 20, 1303, yielded Gascony, and so ultimately complied with all the terms of the Award of Boniface.⁵ The finally complete peace between England and France was proclaimed in London on June 2, 1303.⁶

Edward on
good terms
with
Boniface to
the end.

Although, as we have noted, Edward would not break the peace with France, in order to help the Pope in his bitter struggle with the unscrupulous Philip, it only remains to say that he refused to assist Philip against Boniface,⁷ and that, as indeed he had good reason to do, he kept on good terms with Boniface till his death.

¹ See the letter to P. from "Jehan le Bailleul", Nov. 23, 1302, ap. Rymer, i, 946. Rec. ed.

² Made near Vaucouleurs. See *supra*, p. 124.

³ Rishanger, p. 211, an. 1302. Cf. p. 213, Phil. "ob detentionem Wasconiaë injustam, timens sibi a Rege Angliæ, per d. Papam ad hoc instigato, guerram parari," etc.

⁴ Rymer (Nov. 25, 1302), i, 913, and 919, March 23, 1303.

⁵ *Ib.*, p. 923 ff. Cf. p. 934, June 10, 1303, for Edward's confirmation of the terms.

⁶ Cf. *Ann. de Wigornia*, p. 556.

⁷ Hence in his treaty with Philip, his agents were empowered to make an alliance with him "against all men except the Pope". *Cal. of C. R.* (1301-7), March 22, 1303, p. 128.

On Feb. 4, 1303, we see the King accepting the Pope's nomination of Robert Orford as bishop of Ely, and expressing his astonishment that the guardians of the temporalities of the see had not already handed them over to him.¹ And within two months of the Pope's death, he ordered that an appeal to him should not be blocked, seeing that "the condition of an appellant ought to be unimpeded".²

¹ *Cal. of C. Rolls*, 1302-7, p. 32.

² *Ib.*, p. 99; *cf.* p. 255.

CHAPTER IX.

FRANCE. SERIOUS TROUBLES BETWEEN BONIFACE AND PHILIP THE FAIR. THE BULL "CLERICIS LAICOS". BERNARD SAISSET, BISHOP OF PAMIEERS, AND THE FATAL TROUBLE BROUGHT ABOUT BY HIM BETWEEN BONIFACE AND PHILIP.

Sources.—The most important collection of documents bearing on the dissensions between Boniface and Philip is to be found appended to the *Histoire du différend entre le Pape Boniface VIII. & Philippes le Bel*, Paris, 1655. This edition also contains: *Le proces criminel fait à Bernard evesque de Pamiez*, 1295. This *Histoire*, with its extensive appendix of documents, has been assigned to Vigor, but generally to Dupuy. It has been criticized as a partial collection (see p. 514 where it is admitted that documents in defence of Boniface have been omitted), badly edited, and as containing documents of more than doubtful authenticity.¹ It still, however, remains of the first importance for the story of the struggle between Boniface and Philip. S. Vigor (or perhaps P. Pithou) was, however, the editor of *Historia eorum quæ acta sunt inter Bonifacium VIII. et Philippum Pulcr.* (Troyes?), 1613. But the small number of its documents is included in the collection of Dupuy. A. Baillet, mostly from Raynaldus, *Annales eccles.*, has added a number of documents to those of Dupuy at the end of his *Histoire des démeslez du Boniface VIII. avec Philippe le Bel*, Paris, 1718. Both Dupuy and Baillet² are distinctly hostile to the memory of Boniface. The *Recherches sur la part de l'ordre de Cîteaux au procès de Boniface VIII.*, Brussels, 1859, is largely made up of very important

¹ Cf. e.g., F. Rocquain, *La papauté au moyen âge*, p. 238 f., Paris, 1881. Cf. the same author's *Philippe le B. et la bulle Ausculta fili*, p. 5, Paris, 1883, where he says: "Dupuy lui-même n'est pas toujours de bonne foi."

² Rocquain, *ib.*, p. 262 n., accuses B. on one occasion of being a "traducteur infidèle ou inexact des documents".

dispatches sent from Rome by his envoys to the count of Flanders.¹ C. Höfler, *Rückblick auf P. Bonifacius VIII. und die Literatur seiner Geschichte in Abhandl. d. bayrisch. Akad. d. Wiss. hist. Kl.*, III, iii, Munich, 1843, has published the "Processus factus jussu D. Clementis P. V. super zelo quem habuit D. Philippus Franciæ rex in petendo convocari concilium super hæresi imposita D. Bonifacio VIII.," and in his paper on "Il processo di Bonifazio VIII.," an extract from the *Atti della pontificia Accademia Romana* (1881), P. Balan has published four documents on the subject.

Modern Works.—Those of Rocquain already cited. More or less favourable to Philip le Bel are E. Renan and V. de Clerc in *Hist. lit. de la France au XIV^e siècle*, 2 vols., Paris, 1865; E. Renan, *Études sur la politique religieuse de Philippe le Bel*, Paris, 1899; E. Boutaric, *La France sous Philippe le Bel*, Paris, 1861. More favourable to Boniface is the valuable work of J. Jolly, *Philippe le Bel*, Paris, 1869.

On the famous bulls "Ausculta fili" and "Unam Sanctam", see on the former (Dec. 5, 1301), F. Rocquain, *Philippe le Bel et la Bulle "Ausculta fili"*, Paris, 1883; and a note, p. 356 ff., in the *Revue d'hist. ecclés.* for 1907, showing that this bull was not burnt; and on the latter (Nov. 18, 1302), P. Mury, "La bulle Unam Sanctam" in vol. xxvi (1879), p. 91 ff. of the *Revue des Quest. historiques*, and the same author in the July no. of 1889, p. 252 ff. The Bull has been translated into English by most of the medieval *Source-books*, e.g., E. F. Henderson, *Select hist. docs. of the Middle Ages*, p. 435 ff. On "L'appel au concile sous Philippe le Bel" see H. X. Arquillière in *Revue des Q. H.*, 1911, p. 23 ff. Important is Mgr. J. M. Vidal's *Bernard Saisset*, bp. of Pamiers, Paris, 1826. It is an extract from the *Revue des sciences religieuses* for 1925-6. A very fair presentment of the case between Boniface and Philip is to be found in *A hist. of the Church of France*, i, p. 58 ff., London, 1872, by the Rev. W. H. Jervis.

As a preliminary to the story of the struggle between Boniface and Philip le Bel, something may well be said about the Pope's principal foe. We have already spoken of Philip's character, and pointed out how difficult it is,

¹ We quote from the extract from vol. xxviii of *Études sur l'histoire du XIII^e siècle*.

from the data at our disposal, to form a just estimate of his character. To avoid the danger of over-praising or over-blaming him, we will strive to set forth only those points in his character upon which the majority of his contemporaries appear to be agreed, and what would seem to be fair deductions from them. We will, therefore, pass over the utterances of the German rhyming contemporary Ottokar who brings such damning charges against Philip that his first editor dared not print them. He declared that they were more worthy of being consigned to eternal darkness than of being exposed to the light.¹ We can only say that no such delicacy prevented Dupuy from printing the foulest of charges against Pope Boniface. On the other hand, Philip is represented as full :—

“ Et de doucor et de pité
Et de droiture, et d'equité.”²

To this description also we need not attach much weight ; but may assert that contemporary French historians generally agree that he was the handsomest of men, and devoted to the chase and to gambling. Hence we may believe that he was brave,³ rather than cowardly,⁴ and, as often happens with hunters when not engaged in the pursuit of game, indolent, and consequently disposed to leave the management of weighty things to others. Then, as he was also a gamester, we need not be surprised

¹ Pez, SS. RR. *Austriacarum*, iii, 1745. The chron. has been re-edited in the M. G. SS., *Deutsche Chron.*, Bd. iv, Thl. 1, 2. Cf. Funk-Brentano, *La bataille de Courtrai*, p. 60.

² Cf. the *Chronique rimée*, attributed vaguely to Geoffrey of Paris (begun c. 1313), ap. RR. FF. SS., xxii, p. 111.

³ “ Fu simple e sage e pou parlour, fier estoil comme i lyon en regardeure.” *Chron. Abrég. de G. de Nangis*, ap. *ib.*, xx, p. 651.

⁴ *Chron. rim.*, p. 93, “ *Lasches et lanier* (indolent).” Cf. pp. 103–4. The same chronicle often speaks of his over-devotion to hunting. Pp. 93, 103 f., 153.

that his habitual companions were not serious and upright men, and that need of money for his gambling made him avaricious.¹ His advisers, naturally chosen from men who were ready to gratify his inclinations, were often gamblers themselves, equally in need of money. Many of them were, of course, far cleverer than the King, and while they got the greater part of the money, Philip got the greater share of the hatred for the exactions which were practised to raise it.² One of his chief counsellors was his gambling friend,³ Enguerran de Marigni, a Norman of low birth, subsequently hanged by Philip's son, Louis X.⁴ Critics called him "the second King of France",⁵ and he is described as a very energetic and acute soldier.⁶ William the Scot, who is a veritable worshipper of Philip, ascribes his wrong doings to evil counsellors. According to William, the King would never himself advise others to do wrong, and so could not believe that others would advise him to do wrong. Accordingly, he trusted self-seeking men.⁷ This last assertion is borne out by that excellent chronicler, Gilles le Muisit, who tells us that Philip followed the advice

¹ *Ib.*, pp. 104 v., 1626-7, and 134.

² Philip got what his counsellors chose to leave him :—

"Cest argent, cest tresor avez
Par les gens que vous decevez."

Ib., p. 96 v., 793 f. Cf. pp. 103, 118. The King was hated for his exactions, p. 142, etc. Aragonese envoys reported to their master, James II., that never had there been a King of France so poor as Philip, and so little appreciated by his people. Cf. Finke, *Mon. Ar.*, i, n. 179, p. 263.

³ In the royal accounts for 1308, ap. *ib.*, vol. xxii, p. 562, among the gambling losses of the King there is one of 40 florins to Enguerran.

⁴ He is set down as one of Philip's bad counsellors by the continuator of the chronicle of Gerard de Frachet, ap. *ib.*, xxi, p. 42.

⁵ Finke, *Mon. Ar.*, i, p. 358.

⁶ "Miles strenuissimus, et nimis sapiens" . . . "de paupere genere." *Chron. Cadomense*, ap. *ib.*, xxii, p. 25.

⁷ *Cont. chron. G. de F.*, p. 205.

of Robert of Artois, and his brothers, as well as that of Pierre Flotte, but not that of his peers and barons.¹ Pierre Flotte, like the Albigenses, William of Nogaret and Plaisan, and like Marigni, was one of that growing body of legists whose presence in excessive numbers in its government has long been the curse of France. There is no better instrument for a tyrant than an unscrupulous lawyer, and such were most of the men of law round Philip. No doubt there was need of limiting the powers and privileges both of the Church and the nobility in certain directions, and some of the ordinances of these legists were just and useful. But many of them "can only be described as the vicious and oppressive expedients of an arbitrary and rapacious *régime*".² And the rule of Philip IV. was an "oppressive *régime* in the name of law".³ His diplomacy, too, says the writer we are here quoting, "was directed by the same spirit of cunning and force which actuated so large a part of his internal administration"; and, aiming specially at the "acquisition of Flanders, and the absorption of Guienne", involved him still further in want of money. He became "a monster of rapacity",⁴ and most unscrupulously used every device for raising money including laying his hands on the property of the Church. We cannot pause further to inquire into the precise share of guilt

¹ *Chronique*, p. 55, ed. Lemaître. He accordingly ascribes his treacherous conduct towards the daughter of Guy Dampierre to the advice of his counsellors: "Omnia autem predicta faciebat rex per consiliarios sue camere," p. 51.

² J. Mackinnon, *The Growth and Decline of the French Monarchy*, p. 17.

³ *Ib.*, p. 17. Accordingly, Mr. Mackinnon says hard things of "A Philip IV. who is before all things a practical selfish man". He denounces Philip's debasement of the coinage, and notes the "revolts at Rouen in 1292, at Bordeaux in 1302, at Paris in 1306, in condemnation of the accursed maltôte (mala tolta) and other excesses of a grinding financial administration." *Ib.*

⁴ Kitchen, *Hist. of France*, i, 369.

to be allocated to the King and his ministers in the terrible evils that afflicted France in his reign, but record that, on his death-bed, Philip professed despair before his children at the sight of his evil deeds, his avarice and the rest. He implored them to make restitution for the property he had ill acquired. "Evil counsel," he exclaimed, "has been my ruin!"¹

Contemporary Italian opinion about Philip was the same as that of his own countrymen. Villani points out that, despite a certain "layman's" virtue, "pleasure-seeking, especially in the chase," caused him "not to devote his powers to ruling his realm, but rather to allow them to be played upon by others, so that he was generally swayed by ill-counsel, to which he lent a too ready credence; whence many perils came to his realm".²

Some modern opinion at least is even less favourable to Philip. Gregorovius calls him "a prince of talent and ambition, an unscrupulous despot".³

However, whatever was the personal character of the handsome Philip, as he was at least nominally responsible for the acts of his reign, we shall simply ascribe them, vile as very many of them were,⁴ to him.

The first and lesser quarrel between Boniface and Philip was in connection with Philip's taxation of the clergy, and the bull "Clericis laicos" which it called forth.

The bull
"Clericis
laicos",
Feb. 24,
1296.

¹ "Mauvez conseil m'a décéu." *Chron. rimée*, pp. 154-5.

² *Chron.*, ix, 65, al. 66.

³ *Rome*, v, p. 172. Philip's opponent, Bernard Saisset, was charged with having said that Philip was like the duck whom the birds elected for their king. He was bigger and more beautiful than any of them, but could do nothing but breathe! He was the handsomest man in the world, but was too stupid to do anything but look at other men. See the charges against him, ap. Martène, *Thes. nov.*, i, p. 1333.

⁴ Sir W. Ramsay decides that "his triumphs over Boniface and the Templars had been obtained by the vilest and most execrable methods". *Genesis of Lancaster*, i, pp. 76-7, Oxford, 1913.

The conduct of Philip had not impressed itself favourably upon Boniface even before he became Pope. As cardinal he had had to deal with the outbreak of the quarrel between the French King and Edward I. over Gascony (1289).¹ He was convinced that Philip was forcing a quarrel. Then, in the first year of his pontificate, he had had to write to Philip that he was most deeply troubled by the line he was taking in connection with the disputes between the bishop of Pamiers and the count of Foix.² But it was Philip's taxation of the clergy that first caused real trouble between them. The action of Boniface in this matter, as in others, has been often misunderstood because the generally recognized immunities of the clergy at this period have not been sufficiently realized. When the Roman Empire embraced Christianity, various privileges were, by imperial legislation, granted to its clergy. Among others was exemption from various taxes.³ This exemption had been continued by the barbarian conquerors of the Empire,⁴ and had been confirmed by the Canon Law—the binding force of which was recognized by Christendom. In the second General Council of the Lateran (1179), the clergy had indeed been allowed voluntarily to contribute to a tax, if the property of the laity proved insufficient to meet the needs of the moment.⁵ However, as this concession

¹ B. Guidonis, *E floribus chron.*, ap. *RR. FF. SS.*, xxi, p. 709.

² *Reg.*, 162, June 17, 1295: "Turbamur in intimis, et graves entimus in pectoris archana puncturas."

³ See the laws cited by Bingham, *Antiquities of the Christian Church*, bk. v, c. 3, vol. i, p. 171 ff., ed. London, 1878; and Thomassin, *Vetus et nova Eccles. disciplina*, pt. iii, lib. ii, cc. 5-9, p. 407 ff., Paris, 1679.

⁴ See Makower, *Constitutional hist. of the Church of England*, pp. 10, 17, 27, 33 ff., etc.

⁵ Cf. *Decret. Greg. IX.*, lib. iii, tit. 49, c. 4, vol. ii, p. 654, ed. Freidberg. The summary of the canon runs: "Laici collectas imponentes clericis vel ecclesiis, . . . si moniti non desistunt, sunt excommunicati cum suis fautoribus. Potest tamen episcopus cum clero eis in necessitate præbere subsidia."

had been abused, the third Lateran Council (1215) had forbidden such impositions and payments of taxes without the consent of the Pope.¹ Wise or not, standing in need of modification or not, such was the law of Christendom of which France, England, etc., were members. But at this period certain local authorities took upon themselves to contravene laws imposed by the whole body to which they belonged. Conspicuous among these was Philip the Handsome, who, just as though there were "no legislative enactments in existence on the subject", maintained his right to tax the clergy as he would the laity. He calmly ignored the fact that the exceptional position of the clergy with regard to State taxation was due to the past goodwill of Christian Princes, and their exemptions were further sanctioned by long custom. Hence, therefore, Philip's political enterprise was one which, under existing circumstances, Boniface "might not unfairly resist".²

He was, moreover, as we have already noted, urged to act by the entreaties of the much-taxed clergy themselves. The practice of taxing the clergy at all had been begun by the ecclesiastical authorities themselves when they imposed the "Saladin" tax for the Crusades. Similar taxes had subsequently been imposed by the Popes for purposes which more directly concerned themselves, such as for opposing the encroachment on the Church by Frederick II., but which were a matter of great concern to all Christians. A practice begun by the Popes was soon taken up by Kings. Especially in France did they begin to impose tithes on their own account for the Crusades, and then for the defence of the realm.

The French
clergy
complain to
Boniface.

¹ *Ib.*, c. 7, p. 655. The summary states: "Clerici non debent necessitatibus seu utilitatibus civitatum . . . etiam ubi non suppetunt facultates, subvenire, nisi prius Romanus Pontifex consulatur."

² Jervis, *A hist. of the Ch. of France*, i, p. 58 ff.

Accordingly we find such a man as Peter of Blois, arch-deacon of Bath, endeavouring to rouse the French bishops to oppose this violation of clerical immunity. He reminded them that a bishop could not have a higher title to fame than as a defender of ecclesiastical liberty.¹ Then, in a spirit of prophecy, he declared (in 1188) that he knew well that if their King chose to burden the Church with every kind of tax, he would find many episcopal supporters.² Despite the impassioned words of Peter of Blois, Kings continued to tax the clergy, and Philip the Fair carried the practice to such an extent that first the nobly independent Order of Cîteaux raised a strong protest against his conduct, and then "the canons, priests, and the whole clergy of the kingdom of France" in union with the Cistercians implored Pope Boniface to intervene on their behalf. The protest of the Order was made at a General Chapter (1296), and in it the monks declared that they were quite ready to pay reasonable taxes for the defence of the land, but not extraordinary imposts without the consent of the Holy See.³ In this protest,

¹ "Non enim potest esse præstantior famæ titulus in prælato quam si viriliter tueatur statum ecclesiasticæ libertatis." Ep. 20, an. 1188, ap. *RR. FF. SS.*, xix, p. 272. "Exiit edictum," he continued, "a Philippo Rege ut . . . oneraretur ecclesia, decimationibus recidivis. Sic paulatim transibit decimatio in consuetudinem."

² "Scio quod si Rex tuus angariis, parangariis, exactionibus, capitationibus, cæterisque sordidis et extraordinariis muneribus ecclesiam decreverit prægravare, quamplures episcopos hujus rei fautores inveniet." Ep. 112, ap. *ib.*, p. 273 f. Cf. ep. 121, ap. *ib.*, p. 275, where he says that Christ made the Church free; but, oppressed by the exactions of the powerful, she is made a slave.

³ "Si talis exactio nova debeatur et posset fieri aliquo modo, nullatenus posset fieri, summo pontifice inconsulto" . . . "Ad ordinaria munera ratione rerum vel patrimoniorum tenetur ecclesia. Ab istis nemo se excusat . . . Ad extraordinaria . . . non tenetur ecclesia, nisi auctoritate summi pontificis sint indicta." Cited in full. ap. Kervyn de Lettenhove, *De la part que l'Ordre, etc.*, p. 13 f. It is an important doc. for the position of the mediæval church in regard to lay taxation.

addressed to the archbishop of Rheims, Pierre Barbet, the monks declare that Philip bore harder on the Church than Pharaoh on the people.

But a protest to a prelate who was a friend of the King was not likely to be of much avail; and so the monks and "all the clergy of France" turned to Boniface, as the monks, on their own account, had already, for the same reason, appealed to Nicholas IV. (1292).¹ They complained that by endless impositions they were treated worse than his subjects by a Pharaoh. He had, at any rate, supported the clergy, whereas "modern princes seem to throw nearly all their burdens on the churches." Instead of receiving with gratitude that part of the goods of the Church which the Roman Pontiff, "whose business it is to provide for the general good—*communibus utilitatibus*," has allowed them to have for that good, they turn what has been granted them to the disadvantage of the clergy and the poor. Accordingly, as many of those whose duty it is to advise Princes, are unwilling or afraid to do so, the writers earnestly appeal to the Pope to put a term to this deadly plague.²

We have already seen how the Pope, moved by these complaints of the French clergy, and especially by those of England, about the oppressive taxes imposed upon them by Princes, issued his bull "*Clericis laicos*", reinforcing existing legislation, and absolutely forbidding the clergy to pay any taxes without the express permission of the Holy See.³ On April 21, 1296, his legates

"*Clericis laicos*"
published in
France,
1296.

¹ "*Supponentes ipsos et ordinem suum et subjectos suos et bona sua . . . S. Rom. ecclesiæ protectioni.*" MSS. n. 359, of the Abbey of Dunes cited *ib.*, p. 8.

² This letter, quoted by K. de L. in full, ap. *ib.*, p. 15 ff., was taken by him from MS. n. 448 of the abbey of Dunes.

³ *Supra*, p. 238 ff. Döllinger, *Hist. of the Church*, iv, p. 84, expressed his belief that one object Boniface had in publishing "*C. l.*" was to compel Edward and Philip to make peace "by contracting their

cardinals Beraldus and Simon, were ordered to publish the decree in France and England.¹ However tactlessly enunciated by Boniface, his decree put forth no new legislation. Its provisions were well known, particularly in France, as it had been emphasized for that country especially by Alexander IV.² Though the bull was not addressed specifically either to France or England, it struck those two countries very strongly at the moment. With regard to France, we read how the maltôte (*mala tolta*), first a hundredth and then a fiftieth of all their goods, had been exacted from the clergy without any reference to the Pope.³

Counter-
action of
Philip, 1296.

Philip, accordingly, affecting to believe that his rights had been especially assailed, forbade, under pain of confiscation, the exportation from the kingdom without his express permission of gold, silver, jewels, or munitions of war. Persons giving information leading to conviction were to have a tenth of the confiscated property. He also forbade foreigners to dwell and to trade in France.⁴ As such a decree was detrimental not only to Boniface,

resources", and he added that the extent of the evil of their taxation of the clergy "justified this act of the Pope".

¹ Potthast, n. 24321; cf. n. 24386.

² See his decree regarding the taxing propensities "in regno Franciæ" of the "communiæ, scabini seu consules et alii domini temporales". He forbade them: "tallias vel collectas seu exactiones quascumque ecclesiis vel personis ecclesiasticis imponere." Ap. *Sexti decretal.*, lib. iii, tit. xxiii, c. 1, vol. ii, p. 1060, ed. Freidberg.

³ W. of Nangis, *Chron.*, 1296, i, pp. 293-4. Here Jervis, *l.c.*, p. 58, though regarding Boniface as "arrogant, irritable, peremptory, and headstrong"—qualities which it will be seen he did not display in this first quarrel with Philip, yet decides: "with regard to the original ground of the quarrel Philip was clearly in the wrong; for his favourite tax, the maltôte, having never been sanctioned by the Pope, could not be imposed upon the clergy according to the existing provisions of the law . . ." "Clericis laicos" only enunciated "a principle which was confessedly in force" even if often violated in practice.

⁴ Decree of Aug. 17, 1296, ap. Dupuy, p. 13.

but to many other people of divers countries, Boniface opposed it both in his own interests and, as his position in the Christian commonwealth entitled him to do, in the interests of the general public.

He sent Philip a long and most dignified but kindly letter in which, though he explained the sweeping prohibitions of "Clericis laicos", he pointed out the wrongs of which Philip had been guilty, and reaffirmed, subject to his explanation, the objectionable bull in its entirety.¹ The Son of God, he said, made his Church free, so that anyone who would interfere with that liberty had grave reason to fear for himself. The new decree of the King appears to threaten it, and is calculated to harm the King himself, his subjects, and foreigners whose ordinary residence is in his territory.

Reply of
Boniface,
Sept. 20.

Seeing, continued Boniface, that from the days when we were in a subordinate position, we have ever shown a special regard for you, it is our duty to strive to withdraw you from a course into which it would seem that you are being dragged by evil counsel. The Pope then pointed out to Philip that it was quite against the spirit "of modern times" to prohibit strangers from carrying on legitimate trade in his kingdom, and that such a prohibition would even turn to the injury of his own people. Already his subjects are losing their love for him on account of the number of burdens imposed upon them, and the more their burdens grow, the more will their love for him grow cold.

Should it be his intention to apply his decree to the Pope and the clergy and their goods, it would not only be an act of folly, but, as a violation of existing laws, would bring upon him the penalty of

¹ Cf. the bull of Boniface, "Ineffabilis amoris," Sept. 20, 1296, *ib.*, p. 15 f., and the note of Dupuy, pp. 19-20. The "Ineffabilis" is also printed in full, *Reg.*, n., 1653.

excommunication already imposed on the violators of those laws.

After enumerating all that he and his envoys had already done for the good of Philip's country, all the efforts they had made to ward off from it the arms of the Empire, of England, and of Spain, Boniface asked if the King could be so ungrateful and so foolish as to add the Church to his other powerful foes. He then urged that if his bull were fairly interpreted, it would be found that, apart from penalties, it had added nothing to existing legislation.¹ He had not absolutely forbidden ecclesiastics to be taxed for the requirements of the realm, but that they should not be taxed without his consent. The King might indeed have had reason to act if ever, in case of necessity, an appeal on this matter had been made to the Holy See in vain. Were a great need to arise, leave would be given to sell the very sacred vessels themselves for the good of the land.²

Again did he point out to Philip that the King of the Romans held that the Empire had been wronged by him and his predecessors in taking lands that belonged to the Empire, especially Burgundy, and the King of England maintained that he had been wronged by him in the matter of Gascony. As then, according to them, there was question of moral wrongdoing, of sin, there could be no doubt that judgment on these cases belonged to him.³ Was then the King going to be so foolish as to

¹ "Constitutio enim nostra, si ad rivalem sensum, postposito congruo, non trahatur, id, . . . statuit, quod alias per sanctiones canonicas est statutum." *Ib.*

² See the statement (tabula) of Robert Mignon, drawn up about 1328, showing the tenths which, as a matter of fact, were granted by Boniface to Philip from the year 1297. Tithes that he had conceded to that despicable prince were being levied in 1307, three years after his agents had hounded his benefactor to death. Cf. *R. F. S.*, xxi, pp. 523, 525, 529.

³ "Dumque in eos super his ipsi peccare te asserunt, de hoc iudicium ad sedem eandem non est dubium pertinere."

add the Apostolic See to his enemies, the more so that, if need be, he and his brethren were prepared to face any loss, even death itself, for the liberty of the Church.

He concluded by again warning Philip not to listen to false interpretations of the bull, but to the words of his subject the learned and upright bishop of Viviers by whom he was sending his letter.¹

To this communication, politically and legally sound, a ^{A projected} reply, which, in its opening sentence, at least, is historically ridiculous,² would appear to have been drafted by some irresponsible individual. Dupuy thought it good enough to be inserted in his collection, but, fortunately for the dignity of the French King, it was never adopted by him. It began by stating that the prohibition about the export of gold, arms, etc., had been made for the protection of the realm, but that, as soon as it was clear that what was desired to be exported would involve no loss to it, the King would give permission for its export. Many of the privileges of clerics have been granted by Princes, and cannot take away from them what is necessary for the government of their realms. Whoever, whether cleric or lay, will not help their King are useless.

¹ Cf. ep. of Boniface to Philip, commending the bp. of Viviers to him (Sept. 22, 1296), ap. Dupuy, p. 23. He begs the King to read his long letter carefully, and to take advice of earnest counsellors on it.

² It began with the absurd statement "Antequam clerici essent, rex Franciæ habebat custodiam regni sui, etc." There were clerics in the country that became France hundreds of years before there was a France or a King of France! With their utter want of a sense of humour, certain French writers are lost in admiration at this ludicrous bombast. "La suite," says Rocquain, *La papauté*, p. 241, "était digne de cet exorde." He does, however, agree that the document was never sent to the Pope, and shows from its title, suppressed by Dupuy, that it consisted of "most splendid replies" drawn up for the King, but was not completed "licet non sit opus perfectum". Quoted by Boutaric, *La France, etc.*, p. 97, n. 2, who also calls attention to the "indécence du ton" of this "totum notabilissimum" document.

Such as cannot help themselves against enemies must pay those who can help them. What sane person is there who would not agree that it was absurd that those who had been enriched and fathered by Princes should not help them against their enemies! ¹ Not to do so is to incur the charge of high treason, to punish which we intend to be more keen.

Philip's
indirect
replies to the
Pope, 1296.

Philip, however, addressed no such ineffectual reply to the Pope. But he gave encouragement to Frederick of Aragon in Sicily, and to the rebellious Colonna cardinals, and made use of his servile bishops. Just about a hundred years before this, Peter of Blois had issued a warning to a correspondent not to rely on the bishops of France against its King. "Be not emulous of evil-doers" (Ps. xxxvi, 1), i.e., the bishops. For," he wrote, "they soothe him with soft flatteries; they are dumb dogs, not daring to bark." ² What Peter believed them to be in 1188, they proved to be in 1296. They did not join the appeal of the Cistercians and of their clergy to Boniface, and they now gave him away.³ Towards the close of the year 1296, or, more probably, in the beginning of 1297, "his devoted sons," the archbishop of Rheims, his suffragans and the abbots of his province, begged the Vicar whom God had placed over his Church and who all

¹ "Quis enim sanæ mentis judicaret licitum . . . sub anathema cohibere, ne clerici, ex devotione Principum ingrassati, impinguati, et dilatati, pro modulo suo eisdem Principibus assistant." Ap. Dupuy, p. 22.

² Ep. 112, ap. *RR. FF. SS.*, xix, p. 273.

³ They utterly failed to realize that, when Philip talked of the Pope's attacking the "liberties of the Gallican Church", he was forging for the Gallican Church "an instrument of royal despotism . . . It was the King, not the Pope, who was labouring to extinguish the immunities immemorially enjoyed by the ecclesiastical order". Jervis, *Ch. of France*, i, pp. 68-9. Cf. p. 71, where he notes that, "from the fourteenth century downwards the uniform tendency of legislation in France was to reduce the Church into subservience and subjection to the Crown."

know has done so much for it,¹ to reconsider the constitution which he had issued in the interests "of ecclesiastical freedom". They impressed upon the Pope that the King and the temporal nobility regarded the constitution as an attack on their rights, for, they urged, all, especially the feudatories of the crown, are bound to come to the aid of the realm. Moreover, they and the other prelates of the kingdom were bound to the King, some by homage, and most of them by the oath of fidelity. They were, therefore, sending bishops to him to explain the perilous position in which they were.

Before this letter arrived, Boniface was continuing to follow a strong but conciliatory line. On February 7, 1297, he had written to tell Philip that he had acted in consequence of repeated outcries which had reached him about the way in which the secular power was taxing the Church,² and that his decree had not been directed specially against him to whom from the days before he became Pope he had been especially attached. But, with regard to the King's edict about the exportation of gold, arms, etc., from the kingdom, and foreign traders, even if, as it said,³ it was directed against external foes, it was altogether too drastic. If, too, it was meant to apply to ecclesiastical persons and things, then its promulgator had rendered himself liable to canonical censure. He had concluded by most paternally begging Philip not to listen

The Pope
begs Philip
to modify
his decree,
1297.

¹ The high praise given to Boniface in this letter (ap. Dupuy, p. 26 f.) should be noted.

² "Clamor ipsorum validus, immo stridor impellens nostros fatigasset auditus." Ep. of Feb. 7, 1297. The register, n. 2309, of Boniface, shows that Dupuy, p. 24, had only published half this letter, of which, then, the initial letters should be, not "Exiit a te", but "De temporum spatiis".

³ He says elsewhere, *Reg.*, 2311, that some had assured him that: "in constitutione præfata ecclesias et personas ecclesiasticas non inclusit (rex)."

to evil counsellors, but to follow in the footsteps of his ancestors and to modify or annul his decree.¹

"Clericis
laicos" is
explained.

To make it easier for the King to do this, he had on the same day (Feb. 7) explained to him that by his constitution he had not intended to prohibit ecclesiastics from giving presents or loans to him, or even talliages in case of necessity, when application to the Apostolic See would cause a delay that would be dangerous. The Roman Church, explained Boniface, was always ready to amend anything that she had done which should prove vexatious; and, in the present case, a cunning or misguided interpretation of his constitution had rendered it so.²

Excom-
munication
against
those who
carried out
Philip's
edict.

About the same time, however, he had instructed his nuncios in France, cardinals Berard and Simon, should they be prevented from sending to Rome monies that belonged to the Pope, to declare excommunicated whoever should thus hinder them.³ Yet, on the very same day (Feb. 9) he had thoughtfully provided for the King's immediate absolution from excommunication should he recall his edict.⁴

Boniface
grants the
prayer of the
hierarchy,
1297.

But now there had arrived in Rome the letter of the French bishops, and Boniface must have begun to realize that he had been betrayed. Still, he would not withdraw his bull. In his reply, therefore, which he addressed to the archbishops of Rheims, Sens, Narbonne, and Rouen, to the bishop of Paris and twenty other bishops, after

¹ Cf. another kind letter to him of the same date (Feb. 7, 1297), *Reg.*, 2309, in which he tells him that he is arranging, with his dispensation, for a marriage between the daughter of the count of Burgundy and one of Philip's younger sons, and for the canonization of his grandfather, Louis.

² Ep. of Feb. 7, "*Romana mater ecclesia*," ap. Baillet, *Hist. des démeslez*, p. 11, n. 3, *Reg.*, n. 2312.

³ Ep. Feb. 9 (*Fraternitati vestræ*) ap. Dupuy, p. 25. This again is only part of the letter beginning: "*Processerunt jam sana*." *Reg.*, n. 2310.

⁴ Ep. Feb. 9, *Reg.*, n. 2311.

dwelling on his special love for France from his early youth,¹ he declared in not a few words how grieved he was to hear from the bishops of the distressful state in which the country was from internal disorders and from the ill-will of the count of Flanders. He then assured the bishops that in his constitution he never had any intention of preventing ecclesiastics from freely, and with his permission, helping their rulers in cases of need.² This, he said, he had often told the King by letter and by envoys. Consequently, under existing circumstances, the bishops could, by his permission, for this once make the King a suitable grant if they were free from any kind of compulsion. Moreover, the grant had not to run for more than a year.³

Though, as far as papal monies were concerned, Philip's edict against the exportation of gold from France was not enforced, the King of France was not content with the *explanations* of "Clericis laicos" hitherto made by Boniface. In his relations with the Pope, he began to take a very lofty tone. He had no intention of acknowledging the Pope as the head of Christendom. The magnificent ideal of the Middle Ages of one great Christian family whose spiritual interests were in the hands of the Pope, and whose temporal affairs were

Philip will not recognize any kind of temporal superior, 1297.

¹ "Ab ipso nostre primordio juventutis." Ep., Feb. 28, 1297, *Reg.*, 2333, "Coram Illo." This statement lends some further colour to the belief that Boniface studied at Paris.

² "Licet enim constitutionem illam (i.e., of course 'Clericis laicos') ediderimus pro ecclesiastica libertate, non tamen fuit nostre mentis intentio ipsi regi aliisque principibus sæcularibus in tam arte (sic) necessitatis articulo . . . viam subventionis excludi, etc." *Ib.* The historian of Flanders, Kervyn de L. expresses disappointment at this attitude of Boniface. "Il faut le dire tristement: Boniface VIII. était réduit, pour ne pas voir son autorité renversée en Italie, à l'abaisser et à humilier en France." *L.c.*, p. 20.

³ On May 15, 1297, he granted permission specifically for the raising of two tenths. See K. de L., p. 21. Cf. *Reg.*, n. 1829, May 12, 1297; and n. 1933 of March 7, 1297.

managed by the Emperor, was passing away. It had to make way for local despotic sovereigns who besides ruling the bodies of their subjects were in many cases to succeed in fastening a religion of their own upon them. A united Christendom was to give place to a group of selfish nations. The Commonwealth of Christ¹ was to yield to a nationalism which was to result in our own times in the greatest catastrophe the world has ever known—the world war of 1914-18. It was Philip the Handsome of France who, more than any other one man, was responsible for the death of Christendom.

In the course of the untiring efforts which Boniface made to keep England and France from war, he wished to impose a two years' truce on the belligerents. But when his nuncios, the cardinals of Albano and Præneste, appeared before Philip to announce the Pope's decision, before even his letters were read, the King proclaimed that in temporal affairs he did not acknowledge any sort of superior, and in dealing with his enemies would not allow himself to be hampered by any truce which another might wish to establish.²

With Philip in such a frame of mind, that, as Guy Dampierre, the count of Flanders, declared, he would not "in his pride recognize anything above him"³; with the Colonna trouble at its height; and, above all, with the disloyalty of the French bishops, who utterly failed to act in harmony with their brethren in England and in Spain, Boniface yielded to Philip. He not only decreed

¹ Jordan of Osnabrück (writing in 1288), *Noticia seculi*, p. 662, ed. Franz Wilhelm, speaks: "De . . . statu rei publice fidei christianæ, id est ecclesie Romanæ." Cf. p. 668.

² See the cardinals' report of Apr. 10, ap. Dupuy, p. 27 f. In spiritual matters Philip, like his predecessors, was ready "devoutly and humbly to obey the precepts of the Apostolic See".

³ See a document of his (Jan. 7, 1296), cited by Kervyn de L., *Hist. de Flandre*, ii, p. 388.

that the French clergy were to be even compelled to pay subsidies to ransom, in case of need, their King or his sons,¹ but he authorized the Kings of France to tax the clergy without reference to the Holy See, in case of necessity. Dupuy, therefore, seeing that the King was to be the judge of "the necessity", might well give as a summary of this bull: "*Clericis laicos*" was not to apply to France.²

The dispute connected with "*Clericis laicos*" between Boniface and Philip was for the moment closed. The Pope's monies were released,³ and there was a more or less perfect peace between the Pope and the King of France for two or three years. During this interval the Pope was constantly conferring favours on the haughty monarch. Many of these favours were pecuniary,⁴ others political, as for instance when, in the interests of France and its King, Boniface bade the archbishop of Lyons not to receive Philip's enemies within his walls.⁵ Favours were also forthcoming during this interval of peace for William and Artaud Flotte, on account of the merits of their father Pierre, "counsellor of our most dear son in Christ, Philip the illustrious King of France,"

Peace
between
Boniface
and Philip,
1297-1301.

¹ *Reg.*, n. 2355, July 27, 1297.

² *Ib.*, "*Etsi de statu regni*," n. 2354, July 27, 1297; or Dupuy, p. 39. Dupuy's summary (of course not strictly correct) runs: "*Bulle de B. VIII., declarant que la bulle 'Clericis laicos' . . . ne s'estend point pour la France.*" The Pope wrote: "*Adjicimus . . . quod si prefatis regi et successoribus suis pro universali vel particulari ejusdem regni defensione periculosa necessitas immineret, ad hujusmodi necessitatis casum se nequaquam extendat constitutio memorata.*" This bull and the others connected with "*Clericis laicos*", along with that bull itself, were all withdrawn by Clement V. ("*Quoniam ex constitutione*"), Feb., 1306.

³ Baillet, p. 75. He cites an order of Parliament for 1296 (?), no doubt 1297.

⁴ *Reg.*, nn. 2361-7, Aug. 8, 1297; 2371, 2373; 2417-19, Feb. 9-23, 1298.

⁵ *Reg.*, n. 2370, Aug. 8, 1297. *Cf.* n. 2369.

and, as it proved, a most bitter enemy of the bestower of the favours.¹ Boniface honoured the father too, as he had honoured the sons. He bestowed upon him the power of nominating and instituting two notaries public, sending him the form of oath that those functionaries had to take,² and granted dignities at his request.³

Mutterings
of the
coming
storm.

But in this interval of peace there were not wanting signs of future trouble. Philip gave further indications of that haughtiness which were to lead to such disasters. In the peace negotiations between France and England inaugurated and promoted with such assiduity by Boniface, the King of France would not suffer him to act as Pope, but merely as a private individual, as Benedict Gaetani.⁴ Whilst our King, throughout the long years of the negotiations, constantly professed that he acted out of reverence for the *Pope*, Philip forced Boniface, even as acknowledged private arbitrator, to agree not to give an award without his permission given in letters patent sent by a special messenger.⁵ No wonder Boniface finally joined the count of Flanders and our own Edward in stigmatizing the pride of the French monarch. Then, anxious to lay his hands on the free city of Lyons, Philip worked with his usual craft, taking advantage of the perennial troubles between the archbishop and the people.⁶

¹ *Reg.*, nn. 2420, Feb. 13, 1298, and 2673, July 1, 1298.

² *Ib.*, n. 2679, July 8, 1298.

³ *Ib.*, n. 2681, March 23, 1298.

⁴ *Reg.*, 2810, June 30, 1298.

⁵ Ep. July 3, 1298, ap. Dupuy, p. 41: "Promittimus quod . . . nostræ nequaquam intentionis existit ad aliquam in reliquis pronuntiationem . . . in hujusmodi negotio ex predicto compromisso procedere, sine tuo expresso consensu præhabito a te per patentes litteras tuas et per specialem nuntium destinando."

⁶ Speaking of Philip's conduct over this very affair, Boutaric, *La France*, p. 406, says of him: "Prudent et rusé, il n'avait recours à la force que lorsque les négociations et les habiletés politiques ne donnaient aucun résultat: il connaissait la puissance de l'argent."

The latter had been foolish enough to call in Philip the Bold, and in 1271, had been taken under his protection. Again there was trouble between the people and their feudal superior, archbishop Henry, and again, too, the French King, this time Philip le Bel, was with the people. On this occasion Boniface undertook the task of mediation. Insisting that interference on the part of the French King should be denied,¹ he instructed his delegates, the archbishop of Narbonne, etc., to commence the work of reconciliation by restoring the state of things before the opening of the quarrel. Their full authority was to be restored to the archbishop and his chapter, and the sentence of excommunication which they had placed upon the people was to be withdrawn.² Then they were to summon the archbishop and representatives of the Chapter and the citizens to appear before the Pope, and he would, with the help of God, settle the matter fairly. The Pope's delegates were meanwhile to take over the government of the city. For the moment the independence of the city was saved. But Philip continued his intrigues, and after the death of Boniface increased his hold on it. Too late the people found that the rule of Philip was much harder than that of their archbishop and the overlordship of the Emperor put together. They revolted, and tried to throw off the King's yoke. They were overmastered, however, and lost their status as a free city; and, while the Empire lost a fief, the Kingdom of France gained a splendid inheritance.³

¹ "Amota etiam manu regis." *Reg.*, n. 2717 (cf. 2718) of July 8, 1298.

² *Ib.* "Archiepiscopo et capitulo . . . ad spiritualia et temporalia que tunc noscebantur extare . . . plenarie restitutis." Speaking in after years of the action of Philip regarding Lyons, Boniface asserted that when canon of Lyons he had learnt all about its privileges, and hence knew that the city "non esse infra limites regni tui", and that "injuriose nimis tractas eandem".

³ Cf. Boutaric, *l.c.*, quoting Ménéstrier, *Hist. municipale de Lyon*.

Boniface
would visit
Philip, 1298.

Anxious if possible to close the growing breach between himself and the King of France, Boniface conceived the idea of a personal interview with him. Unfortunately, however, he had to content himself with writing a very kindly letter, and telling the King that he had been suffering from long and severe illness, and had not yet recovered, and that the burdens of old age were pressing so severely upon him that he was afraid he would have to abandon his intention.¹

Although at this time, the relations between Philip and the Pope were so far friendly that the latter could ask the King for a loan for Charles of Valois, who was about to come to Italy,² he had not unfrequently to protest against Philip's high-handed action against the Church. Even when he had been nuncio in France he had had to protest against the unjust detention by him and a certain Geoffrey de Valeya of properties belonging to the bishop of Poitiers. He had now to repeat the protest and beg the King "out of a love of justice and reverence of the Apostolic See" to cause restitution to be made of the bishop's property.³ About a fortnight later, he had to accuse Philip of abusing the privileges which had been granted him by the Apostolic See, and of diverting the goods of the Church to his own uses. He implored him to restrain his officials who were daily inflicting intolerable injuries on the Church of France⁴

Some three months after this, there was greater trouble. Peter Barbet, archbishop of Rheims, had died on Oct. 3, 1298, and Robert of Courtenai had succeeded him by

¹ Ep. of Dec. 29, 1298, ap. Potthast, n. 24754, from E. Boutaric in *Notices et extraits*, vol. xx, pt. ii, p. 129 f.

² Ep. Dec. 29, 1298, ap. Pot., n. 24755. This and the preceding and some other letters are printed in full in *Notices et extraits*, vol. xx.

³ *Reg.*, n. 2865, Jan. 15, 1299.

⁴ Baillet, *Hist.*, p. 22, n. 6, from Raynaldus, 1299, n. 25, Jan. 28, 1299.

election and papal provision.¹ Meanwhile Philip had taken possession of the temporalities of his see, and on grounds which Boniface declared frivolous would not for a long time hand them over to the new elect. They were only surrendered after much worry and trouble on the part of the Pope.²

Relations thus long strained were finally broken in connection with one who must be pronounced a distinctly difficult person, Bernard Saisset, bishop of Pamiers. A man of noble birth, he had when in Rome, to which his quarrels often brought him, commended himself to Boniface by his courage and directness—qualities much appreciated by such a character as Benedict Gaetani. As abbot of St. Antoninus³ of Pamiers, he had for a long time been before the public by reason of his quarrels with Roger-Bernard III., the savage count of Foix, with regard to rights of jurisdiction over Pamiers; by reason of his having been employed on missions by the Holy See,⁴ and finally by reason of difficulties which he had with the bishop of Toulouse in settling the boundaries of his see after he had been made bishop. It was in connection with his disputes with the count of Foix that Bernard got into relations with Boniface, and brought about fresh trouble between him and King Philip. When Bernard appealed to the Pope, the count of Foix had no difficulty in persuading Philip that the appeal in connection with civil rights was an insult to the royal authority.⁵ Boniface and the abbot

Bernard
Saisset, bp.
of Pamiers.

¹ *Reg.*, n. 3022, Apr. 10, 1299.

² *Reg.*, epp., nn. 3024–32, Apr. 28, 1299.

³ Otherwise known as the abbey of Frézélas or Frédélas.

⁴ In one such mission on which he had been sent he displayed so little tact that Honorius IV. practically disowned him. Cf. *Reg. Hon. IV.*, n. 608, ed. Prou, and Vidal, *B. S.*, p. 26.

⁵ Cf. Vidal, p. 28 ff. When abbot Bernard first appealed to Rome, Nicholas IV. named card. Benedict G. protector of the abbey (March 5, 1292).

were now face to face with Philip and the count. To strengthen the position of the abbot, Boniface made him a bishop. Then, carrying out the intention of Clement IV., he divided the diocese of Toulouse, and, making Pamiers a city, its abbey church a cathedral, and its college of canons a cathedral chapter, he named Bernard its first bishop (July 23, 1295).¹ Previous to that he had written to Philip to remind him that his grandfather, St. Louis, had, at the request of Pope Clement IV., undertaken to defend the "villa" of Pamiers "for the honour of the Roman Church", and to beg him to see that count Roger restored the villa to the abbot of the monastery of St. Antoninus to whom it belonged.² Fortunately, through the mediation of the lord of Mirepoix, an agreement was come to between the count and the new bishop (Nov. 7, 1297), which was approved by Pope Boniface,³ and led to a complete reconciliation between the two (June 25, 1300). Meanwhile, however, the people of Pamiers, whose wishes in this matter would appear to have been quite ignored by all concerned, had turned against both bishop and count, and had brought down upon themselves from the Pope the major excommunication with all its dread effects (Nov. 28, 1299).⁴ This drastic action of Boniface was followed by appeals on the part of the people both to the Pope himself and to the King; but they were not absolved till May 13, 1304, by Benedict XI.,⁵ the successor of Boniface.

¹ Bull of erection, ap. *Bullar. Rom.*, iv, p. 132 ff. Cf. Theoderic of Niem, *Vitæ RR. PP.*, ap. Eccard, *Corpus*, i, p. 1465; Potthast, nn. 24148, 24185; Vidal, p. 39.

² Ep. of June 17, 1295, ap. Dupuy, p. 625.

³ *Reg.*, n. 2907, Feb. 17, 1299. Cf. n. 3092, May 18, 1299, by which Boniface instructed certain bishops to see that the agreement between the two was kept. The papal ratification is said to have cost no less than 24,000 gold florins. Vidal, *l.c.*, p. 44.

⁴ *Reg.*, n. 3340.

⁵ *Reg. Bened. IX.*, n. 1257.

Meanwhile the position which Philip the Handsome had once held in the eyes of the Pope and of the cardinals was steadily being altogether lost. In the beginning of the year 1298, the envoys of the count of Flanders could write to their master that at that time no one dared say a word about the King of France except in his praise.¹ But Philip seemed bent on pursuing his evil courses, whether his conduct caused a rupture with the Pope or not. He abused without the slightest scruple the concessions which the Pope had made him in the matter of clerical taxation forbidden by the bull "Clericis laicos", and arbitrarily set at naught the rights of churches and churchmen. Because Boniface had had occasion to suspend the bishop of Laon and summon him to Rome, Philip, affecting to believe that the see was vacant, calmly took possession of its revenues.² The following is a worse example of his tyrannical conduct. By his will cardinal Jean Cholet had left a sum of money to enable poor masters to get a theological training at Paris. The money had been arbitrarily annexed by Philip.³ Despite a protest on the part of Boniface, we learn from a letter of his successor that the monies were still sequestered on Feb. 8, 1304.⁴

Philip's
oppressive
taxation and
unfriendly
acts
towards
Boniface,
1298-1301.

In pursuance of his policy of crushing his weaker neighbours, and adding their territory to his own kingdom, Philip took possession of the county of Maguelonne, which was a fief of the Holy See, as the bishop of the now destroyed town of Maguelonne⁵ was the Pope's vassal.

Philip's
encroach-
ments on
Maguelonne
and
Narbonne.

¹ "Et certes, sire, li rois (Philip) a si le court pervertie que à paines i a-il nul qui en apiert ose de li dire forsque loenge; mais cascuns connoist bien et seit que ce est li volenteis dou souverain." Dispatch of Feb. 19, 1298, ap. Kervyn de L., p. 58.

² "Prætextu cujusdam consuetudinis, quam appellas regalia," wrote B. to the King, Oct. 12, 1298, ap. Raynaldus, *Ann.*, 1298, n. 24.

³ *Reg.*, 2625, July 12, 1298.

⁴ *Reg. Bened. IX.*, n. 1169.

⁵ See C. Eulart, *Villes mortes du moyen âge*, p. 31 ff., Paris, 1920.

Attempts on the independence of this county had been made in the days of St. Louis by the royal agents; but a full representation of the case by Pope Clement IV. to the saint had resulted in the discomfiture of the King's officials.¹ But their successors returned to the charge in 1300, and Boniface had to adjure Philip to order his ministers to leave the county in the enjoyment of its liberty.² In the same letter in which he had to complain to the King of encroachments on the Church of Maguelonne he had also to call attention to attacks on the rights of the archbishop of Narbonne (Gilles Aycelin) by Amauri, viscount of the same city. The latter maintained that he held his fiefs in Narbonne and its suburbs not of the archbishop but of the King. A council held at Béziers (Oct. 29, 1299) appealed to the Pope and to the King for justice to their archbishop.³ As the rights of the archbishop were clear, Boniface naturally espoused his cause, and not only brought the matter before Philip's notice,⁴ but strictly forbade the archbishop to come to any terms without the knowledge of the Holy See.⁵ But as Philip was behind the viscount, the affair was not settled till the days of Benedict XI. when it was agreed that Amauri should recognize the archbishop as his feudal superior, and the archbishop should take the oath of fealty to the King.⁶ Philip made some capital at least out of every one of his direct or indirect attacks on the rights of others. "There was a time," wrote Boniface

¹ Cf. epp. of Clem. IV., ap. Potthast, 19811-2, Sept., 1266.

² Ep. of July 18, 1300, ap. Raynaldus, *Ann.*, 1300, n. 27 ff., Pott., n. 24969. Boniface appended to his own letter that of Clement IV. just cited. The fief is called "the county of Melgorium in the diocese of Maguelonne".

³ Cf. Hefele, *Conc.*, vi, pt. i, p. 458 ff., ed. 1914.

⁴ Ep. of July 18, "Recordare, rex inclyte" just cited.

⁵ Cf. *Reg. Bened. XI.*, n. 749, March 30, 1304.

⁶ *Ib.*

in connection with these two cases, "when the Church, nourished by the gifts of Kings,¹ increased in power, dignity, and glory before the world. But now, alas! it is by Kings and their ministers that it is oppressed, enslaved, and in every way vilified. My son! by tolerating these abuses in the churches of your realm, you have every reason to fear that the Lord God of Justice, the King of Kings, will exact vengeance for them. Nor in the end will His vicar keep silent, lest perchance he should hear the reproach of being a dumb dog unable to bark. For a time he waits with patience that the way of mercy may not be closed; but at last he will arise for the punishment of the evil doer and the glory of the good. O that you would give heed and understand and take thought for your last end, and see through the suggestions which as it were by evil spirits are made to you, and not lend a ready ear to the whisperings of evil counsellors. . . . Beware then lest the counsels of men who deceive you by flattery should lead you to an end without glory."

But Philip was not content with attacking Boniface through attacks on the rights of the Church, he also irritated him politically. One can hardly offend a friend more than by giving encouragement to his bitterest enemies. Yet Philip supported the Colonnas, and received them into his realm (July, 1299).² As if this act was not unfriendly enough, some months later (Dec. 8, 1299), he concluded an alliance near Vaucouleurs with the German usurper, Albert of Austria, whom the Pope had refused to recognize, and with whom he had urged Philip not to ally himself.³ Boniface

Political acts
against
Boniface,
1299.

¹ "Regum lactata mamillis," as the Pope forcibly expresses it. Ep. of July 18, cited above.

² *Supra*, p. 224.

³ Cf. A. Leroux, *Les relations polit. de la France avec l'Allemagne* (1292-1378), p. 103. Stubbs, *Germany in the later Middle Ages*, p. 88, remarks: "Now Philip the Fair was beginning his political struggle with Boniface VIII., and the opposition showed and proved by that Pope

was convinced that they would embroil the whole of Christendom.¹

At every moment, too, the envoys of the count of Flanders were pouring into his ears stories of the overbearing and treacherous manner in which Philip was treating their fellow-countrymen and their feudal lord,² and calling upon him as the supreme judge to help them.³ At the same time complaints from France were constantly being made to him that Philip was abusing the concessions he had made to him in the matter of clerical taxation.⁴ On August 15, 1298, the Order of Cîteaux had paid one tenth, and by threats two more were exacted from them on February 25, 1299.⁵ The abbots of this famous monastery, one of the great centres of European civilization, were not exaggerating when they declared that the King's taxes were ruining it. Philip lived to acknowledge that it was ruined.⁶ Nevertheless, despite all this arbitrary treatment of the Church, an Aragonese envoy could report to his master as late as September, 1301, that Philip's wishes were law at Rome.⁷ But the

to Albert had the effect of drawing together these two worthies, *the two most unscrupulous persons who ever, I imagine, reigned contemporaneously in Europe.*"

¹ See a letter, Jan. 17, 1300, of the Flemish envoys to their master: We know "ke li acors et amistei kei est faite entre les rois d'Allemagne et de Franche lui desplaist . . ." The Pope and the church of Rome "bien leur sanle ke il e li rois de Franche voellent tout esbranler". Ap. Kervyn de L., *Études*, p. 79.

² K. de L., *passim*, and *supra*, p. 280.

³ See especially the famous letter of Dec. 29, 1299, ap. K. de L., p. 75 ff.

⁴ See the letter to the Pope from the Abbot of St.-Germain-des-Prés, March 1, 1299. In this case payments at the court of Rome had their share in the distress of the monastery. Ap. K. de L., p. 24, n.

⁵ Cf. K. de L., p. 23, and the letter of the abbot of Cîteaux there quoted.

⁶ See his letter of March 20, 1313, ap. *ib.*, p. 98.

⁷ See the report of Gerald to James II., ap. Finke, *Mon. Arag.*, i, 104.

end of his influence was at hand. It was in the midst of all these evidences of a tendency on the part of Philip "to subordinate the Church to the State",¹ that word reached Boniface that the King had arrested Bernard Saisset, bishop of Pamiers, and, under an armed escort, had taken him away from his diocese.² He at once wrote to the King to protest against this breach of recognized law. Reminding him that by "divine, canonical, and human law" ecclesiastics enjoy great liberties and immunities, and that his ancestors respected those liberties, he tells him that it has been reported to him that he has haled the bishop of Pamiers before him, put him under the custody of the archbishop of Narbonne, and taken possession of his property. "His Highness" was therefore exhorted to send the bishop to the Pope, to restore his goods, and not to do the like again. He was, moreover, plainly told that, if what was reported about the matter was true, and no reasonable excuse was forthcoming, it would appear that he had incurred the canonical censures imposed for laying violent hands on a bishop. Philip was finally informed that the archbishop had been ordered to release the bishop, and send him to Rome (Dec. 5, 1301).³

The arrest of
the bishop of
Pamiers,
1301.

¹ Rocquain recognizes in the actions of the temporal power in the thirteenth century the tendency noted in the text. *La Papauté*, p. 230.

² Some late mediaeval historians (Dupuy, p. 9, seem to be relying on Nicole Gilles, † 1503) and most modern ones say that the bishop had been sent to Philip by the Pope, and had been arrested owing to insolent language which he had addressed to the King. They are certainly mistaken. With the Register of Boniface now accessible, it is clear that Bernard had not any commission from the Pope at this time.

³ *Reg.*, n. 4432. The order was given to the archbishop on the following day. *Ib.*, n. 4433. The former letter was also printed by Dupuy, p. 661. The charges against B. S. were first brought by Pierre Flotte before the archbp. of Narbonne. In the most bullying manner Pierre ordered his metropolitan to arrest Bernard. "Significo enim

Suspension
of the
exemptions
from
"Clericis
laicos".

But Boniface realized that the time had come to deal not merely with the particular case of Bernard Saisset, but with the general conduct of Philip. Accordingly on the very same day on which he had taken action concerning the bishop of Pamiers, he issued a number of important bulls regarding the general situation. In one, entitled "*Nuper ex rationabilibus causis*",¹ by suspending the exemptions which he had granted to Philip in connection with the bull "*Clericis laicos*", he thereby put it into force again. However, he granted the King nearly a year, i.e., till the following November, during which the privileges he had granted him could be discussed and the total suspension possibly modified.

French
clergy
summoned
to Rome,
Dec. 5, 1301.

At the same time (Dec. 5) he summoned to appear before him by the first of November following, the bishops of France, representatives of the chapters, the great abbots of Cîteaux, Cluny, etc., and the doctors of theology and canon law.² They were told that they were to be consulted on the various outrages which for a long time past were said on good authority to have been inflicted on the clergy by King Philip and his officials. They were summoned, so they were informed, in order that the

vobis ex parte d. Regis, quod nisi ad captionem . . . ipsius processeritis . . . d. Rex sibi . . . in hac parte ob vestri defectum opportuno remedio providebit." Ap. Dupuy, p. 656.

¹ Including another beginning "*Salvator Mundi*" of Dec. 4, ap. Dupuy, p. 42 f. That author, not realizing that Boniface counted the years of his reign from his coronation, and not from his election, has by mistake assigned this bull to the year 1300. He tells us that on the back of the original bull from which he drew his copy there was a note to the effect that it had been withdrawn both by Benedict XI. and Clement V., and that their bulls were in the same coffer (*scrinium*). As these two bulls were by order of Pope Clement V. erased from the Register of B. VIII., they are there now printed (nn. 4422, 4423) from Dupuy's edition.

² *Reg.*, nn. 4426-31. Master Peter of Limoges was specially summoned. No. 4426 begins: "*Ante promotionem nostram.*" Also in Dupuy, pp. 53-4.

Pope could be guided by men at once well informed and partial to their King,¹ and they were also told that the King had been notified that, if he chose, he too could send proctors to present his case.

What he had done at this time, and why he had done it, Boniface next explained to Philip himself in the well-known bull "Ausculta fili". It was issued on the same day as the others which we have just cited (Dec. 5, 1301), and was in the main a model of what a well-merited expostulatory letter ought to be. It was written in a spirit that was kind and moderate, but firm and plain at the same time. But just because it was, in clear terms, justly condemnatory of the King's conduct by one who had a recognized right to criticize it, it was hateful to Philip and his evil advisers. They accordingly denounced it to Clement V. as a standing insult to the crown of France, and, by a deplorable act of weakness, he suffered it to be mutilated in the Register of its author. Accordingly the version of the bull in the modern printed edition of the Register,³ is made up of what was left in the original register with the missing portions supplied from Dupuy,⁴ after his copy had been compared with the one given in the process which Philip instituted against his judge.⁵

"Give ear, my son!" began the Pope, "to the words of thy father and to the teachings of thy master who, on this earth, holds the place of Him who is the sole Master and Lord. Open thy heart and willingly give heed to the

¹ N. 4426. You, said the Pope to the bishops, "apud eundem regem suspicione caretis, et sibi et regno accepti estis et grati, et diligitis ipsum regem." No one can fail to see how moderate is all this action of Boniface.

² It is a pity that in his well-merited castigation of the ministers of Philip le Bel, he spoke of them as "ministers of (the idol) Bel". Dupuy, p. 57.

³ N. 4424.

⁴ P. 48 ff.

⁵ To be found "in tabulario Vaticano X., 193, p. 303".

admonitions of thy Holy Mother the Church. Follow her guidance so that with a sorrowful heart you may return to your God from whom through sloth or evil counsel you have strayed.”¹ The King was a member of that Church of Christ of which Peter was the head whose duty it was to oppose every kind of evil. Then quoting Jeremias (i, 10) as his predecessors were wont to do, he reminded Philip that he had been set by God “over the nations and over kingdoms to root up and pull down and to waste and to destroy and to build and to plant”. “Wherefore, my dearest son, let no one persuade you that you have no superior,² and that you are not subject to the chief shepherd of the fold. Though among all kings, Boniface in every period of his life has ever displayed most affection for the royal house of France, he cannot, nevertheless, pass over the King’s misdeeds, or fail to bring before him the evils he is inflicting on all classes. In person, when he was in an inferior station, he had warned Philip, and since he became Pope he had exhorted him by letters, by nuncios, by his own people, and by others, to govern his realm in peace, to abstain from oppressing his clergy and people, and not to extend his grasping hands, or, as he finely expressed it, his “*occupatrices manus*” from what belonged to others. His efforts had been in vain. Philip had continued to bestow benefices without consulting the Holy See; to interfere with the appointments of the Holy See; to reject every judge but himself on the wrong-doings committed in his name; to seize church property, and against all

¹ These last words were erased from the Register.

² That is what nowadays every thinking man is saying to rulers and governments; and, to impress this truth on them, many of them have instituted the League of Nations. It remains to be seen whether this body, which has no sanction behind it, but a limited and rather half-hearted public opinion, will succeed even as well as the Pope’s did in restraining the ambition of kings and Governments.

law to bring clerics under his jurisdiction.¹ His personal knowledge, acquired when he was one of its canons, lets him see how much the King has wronged the Church of Lyons. Under the pretext of *regalia*, Philip has seized the revenues of vacant churches; he has also caused the gravest loss to all sorts of persons by prohibiting them from exporting their property, and he has debased the coinage. Complaints too from all quarters have reached the Pope on the intolerable burdens he has laid on all classes.² As on these and similar grievances, Boniface has often to no purpose complained to the King, and as his duty as pastor and as guardian of public law compels him to act, he has summoned the bishops of France to consult with them as to what should be done.³ In what shall be decided every possible effort will be made to injure the King's honour as little as possible. But he has himself first allowed it to be tarnished by listening to evil counsels.

After putting before the King the needs of the Holy Land, and telling him that its defence had been left to Tartars, Boniface concluded this dignified rebuke by begging Philip so to act as to avoid the dread judgments of God and those of the Holy See.

As the bearer of all these important documents, Boniface selected one of his notaries, James "de Normannis". This he did, as he explained to Philip, not only because he was a man endowed with knowledge, uprightness, and prudence, but also because he was known to be one who had a love for France and its king.⁴

¹ "Licet," he added, "in clericos . . . nulla sit laicis attributa potestas."

² "Multorum ad nos insinuatio clamosa perducit, etc."

³ "Cum autem nos debitum pastoralis officii urgeat, et *publice utilitatis intersit*, etc."

⁴ *Reg.*, nn. 4439-43, Dec. 16-19, 1301. "Idem notarius, quem nedum Ecclesie Rom. fidelem, set et tui ac dicti regni dilectorem

Philip's
proceedings
against
Bernard.

We must now see what had meanwhile really happened to the bishop of Pamiers. Among other opponents whom Bernard's indiscretions had turned into bitter enemies was Peter, bishop of Toulouse.¹ Mainly through him, Bernard Saisset was accused of having used grossly disrespectful language about the King, and of being a traitor. Here again, no doubt the bishop's imprudence had played into the hands of his foes. If he were out of the way the King's hold on Pamiers would be strengthened so that doubtless Philip or his agents were ever watching him. In the course of his many differences with King, count, and bishop, a man of his character had probably said many wild things. It was easy enough, therefore, from the count of Foix, the bishop of Toulouse, etc., to get evidence against him sufficient for a charge of treason.

However much of this may be, Philip sent Richard Leneveu, archdeacon of Auge, and the knight John of Picquigny, vidame of Amiens, to the county of Toulouse to make *secret* inquiries into the truth of the stories about the bishop's disloyalty. For a long time, so we are told, he had refused to heed the rumours which had reached him to the discredit of the bishop. At length, however, they became so persistent that his honour required that they should be investigated.²

novimus, etc." Ep. 4440 to Philip. This furnishes another proof of the care taken by Boniface to avoid any needless cause of offence to Philip.

¹ *Supra*, p. 313. Hence Bernard in his protest against the way in which he was treated when first arrested says: "Prædicta omnia facta sunt procurante et ordinante episcopo Tholosano." Ap. Dupuy, p. 652.

² See the report of these worthies, ap. Dupuy, p. 628. Before the end of the summer of 1301, they had examined some 23 witnesses. Only naturally the principal ones against Bernard were Roger Bernard, count of Foix, and his friends. It was chiefly on their evidence that the charges of treason against Bernard were based. The bishop of Toulouse and other ecclesiastics when formally approached by the King's inquisitors said little or nothing to incriminate Bernard. The evidence of these witnesses is given ap. Dupuy, pp. 632-51. The count

As these "inquisitors" prosecuted their secret inquiries they soon found from "trustworthy persons", that Bernard was a simoniacal heretic, who declared that fornication was no sin, that Pope Boniface was "a devil incarnate", who had declared that King Louis IX. was a saint in heaven whereas he was in hell.

It is, unctuously remarked these "inquisitors" who had been bidden to work so that the people would not know what they were doing,¹—it is much more serious

of Foix declared that what he had said to the King's inquisitors he had already said to the bishop of Toulouse, who had engaged to reveal the bishop's treason to the King. *Ib.*, p. 634. More independent witnesses, like the two Dominicans, Arnaud Dejean and Pierre Bernard, put a very different complexion on many of bishop Saisset's utterances. Some of them were said "after drink". With regard to the kingdom coming to an end in Philip's reign, the bishop had only said that King Louis on his deathbed had warned Philip that the kingdom would end with him or his son; but that, if he were good and just, it would endure in their house to the twelfth generation or even longer. (*As a matter of fact*, the kingdom did pass out of Philip's family with his son; for his nephew, Philip VI. of Valois, succeeded the last of his sons, Charles IV.!) He did not believe the bishop had sided with the English against the King, because he himself in the bishop's behalf had, in the presence of Pierre Flotte, offered the King the condominium of the city of Pamiers, because the bishop had said that, if he allowed the count of Foix to have the whole city the King would soon lose the whole county of Toulouse. Arnaud did not deny that the bishop had said that the King had coined bad money, but he added boldly and significantly that the bishop could not be blamed much for saying that; nor did brother Peter Bernard deny that the bishop had said that the King was often hunting when he ought to have been in the Council chamber, and that he had bad advisers. How the mists of falsehood are dissipated by a ray of truth! Another witness said that the bishop had averred that Pierre Flotte did nothing without a bribe. This gives a clue to the hatred of Pierre for Bernard. *Ib.*, p. 639.

¹ "Rex misit (the above-mentioned couple) ad partes Tolosanas, eis præcipiens ut sic curiose, sic caute prædicta perquirent . . . ut a populo ante tempus hoc non posset percipi." The report, p. 628. As we learn from the story of the arrest of Bernard drawn up for the archbishop of Narbonne, even he, the ecclesiastical superior of B. S., knew nothing of this inquiry. See the *Gesta in captura B. Saget* (sic), ap. Martène, *Thesaurus novus Anecdotorum*, i, p. 1319.

to offend eternal than temporal majesty; and so, of course, they found that the man who had sinned against God, the faith, and the Roman Church, had been also disloyal to his King.¹

When at length, by direct action on the part of these "inquisitors" Bernard learnt what was in progress, he had at once asked his archbishop and the King permission to go to the Pope.² Meanwhile, however, the vidame had, in the middle of the night, roused the aged bishop out of his bed, taken possession of his goods and chattels in the King's name, and seized a number of his chaplains and household (July, 1301).³ It is true that when this high-handed action was reported to the King, he ordered his chancellor, Pierre Flotte, to issue letters reversing the acts of the vidame, but at the same time commanded that Bernard should appear before him on the octave of the feast of St. Michael (Sept. 29),⁴ instead of going to Rome. Whether or no in consequence of secret instructions, the vidame refused to obey the royal orders relative to the return of Bernard's property. Moreover the commander of the royal crossbow men (*magister balistariorum*) with the Seneschal of Toulouse, and a number of followers, appeared on the scene "to escort" the bishop to the King. They came, says the report we are quoting, "more, it was said, to guard him than to honour him".⁵

¹ *Ib.*, p. 629.

² *Gesta*, p. 1320.

³ *Ib.* See also the protest made in Bernard's behalf to the King apropos of his treatment by the vidame and his associates, ap. Dupuy, pp. 651-3. It shows how violent and illegal were all the initial proceedings against the bishop by all parties concerned, and even asserts that some of the bishop's clerics were put to the torture. Dupuy, p. 652.

⁴ *Gesta*, p. 1320.

⁵ "Potius, ut dicebatur, causa custodiæ quam honoris." *Gesta*, p. 1322.

On hearing of this, the archbishop of Narbonne in great distress sent to beg the King to remove the guard from the bishop or otherwise he would be in danger of incurring canonical censure. By way of reply, Philip simply said he would deal with the matter at an assembly at Senlis on the Tuesday after the feast of St. Luke (Oct. 18, 1301). Thither, still under guard, the poor old bishop, weak and ill,¹ had to appear before a great assembly of clergy and nobles and hear himself accused by the King of heresy, treason, sedition, injurious words against the Royal family, etc.² All these charges, said the King, were to be established hereafter on the evidence of trustworthy persons. Meanwhile, his archbishop was ordered to put the bishop in custody.³ He, however, protested that matters must not be hurried on so fast, that the Pope and others must first be consulted, and that the King ought not to act tyrannically but mercifully. But though the bishop denied the charges against him, threats of violence against him on the part of the courtiers made the archbishop give way. Accordingly much against his inclination and after his loyalty had been called in question, he consented to imprison his suffragan. He next asked that the bishop should be sent to the Pope, his proper judge ;

The
assembly at
Senlis, Oct.,
1301.

¹ On the journey : " arripuit dictum episcopum fluxus . . . deinde febris cum flux." *Ib.* Bernard in his protest speaks of his " senectutis et infirmitatis ", ap. Dupuy, p. 652.

² The charges at great length were actually recited by the chancellor Pierre Flotte. They are printed, ap. Martène, *l.c.*, p. 1330 ff., or ap. Dupuy, p. 653 f. The bishop was accused of having said that Philip would be the last king of his line, that he was a mere image, unfit to be king, that like all his court he was wholly corrupt, that he had no rights over the city of Pamiers, that he had plotted in every way against the kingdom of France, everywhere helping its enemies, that he had tried to stir up the Pope against the bishop of Toulouse, etc. " All these things or the greater part of them " had he done ! Cf. the report of the bishops of Béziers and Maguelonne, ap. Mart., *l.c.*, p. 1334.

³ *Gesta*, p. 1323.

but the King replied that he was going to send his envoys to the Pope on the matter, and he would stand by his finding.¹

Boniface
momentarily
turns against
Bernard S.,
1302.

It was before Philip's envoys reached Rome that Pope Boniface, on the strength of the first reports that had reached him about the Pamiers affair,² had sent off the letters (Dec. 5) of which we have already spoken, summoning bishop Bernard to Rome. When, however, the King's charges against the bishop of Pamiers were laid before him, even he appears to have been so shocked by the number of them as to have imagined that at least in the main there must have been truth in them. At any rate, he wrote to tell the archbishop of Narbonne and the bishops of Béziers and Maguelonne how grievously distressed he was to learn about the dreadful things (he enumerated them at length in his letter) which had been done by the bishop of Pamiers. He recalled his orders about his liberation and about his being sent to Rome. Without regarding any appeal that the bishop might make to Rome, the archbishop was to examine into the charges made against him, and then send his report to the Pope along with the bishop himself. This was on January 13, 1302.³ Before ten years had elapsed, the world had seen the illegal methods used by Philip, or the unscrupulous gang that surrounded him, against the unfortunate bishop of Pamiers employed on a more extended scale against Pope Boniface himself and the

¹ "Cujus (the Pope's) voluntati se in his asseruit paritutum." *Ib.*, p. 1326.

² He no doubt was informed of the state of affairs by his nuncio, Nicholas Alberti, bp. of Spoleto, afterwards cardinal-bp. of Ostia (1303), whom the sources we have just cited speak of as present with King Philip. He had been sent to France to push on the question of the fulfilment of the peace treaty between England and France. He had found Philip "difficult". See his letter to Boniface of June, 1301, ap. Kern, *Acta Imperii*, n. 146, p. 96.

³ *Reg.*, n. 4269.

noble Order of the Templars. Meanwhile, Boniface was soon to learn that the French King and his legists were not attacking particularly the bishop of Pamiers, but the liberties of the Church. In a few months he found himself engaged in a life and death struggle with a power much more dangerous, because more cunning, than that of the rulers of the Holy Roman Empire of the German nation.

An Englishman, Thomas of Walsingham, writing briefly and *most confusedly* of the affair of the bishop of Pamiers, and writing, too, more than a hundred years after it had taken place, says that Pierre Flotte brought to Rome the charges against the bishop.¹ In accordance with the decisions arrived at during the deliberations at Senlis, the royal messenger, whoever he was, told the Pope that his master was of opinion that he could and ought to punish out of hand so great a traitor as the bishop of Pamiers, because such guilt as his excluded every privilege.² Still, out of respect for the Pope who holds God's place on earth he asked (*requirit*) him to degrade the bishop, so that the King might punish him at once, as there was no hope of his amendment, as he had been wicked from his youth.³ According now to Walsingham, Pierre Flotte delivered his message with such insolence that Boniface cried out in exasperation: "I have both

Supposed
dialogue
between
Boniface and
Pierre
Flotte, 1302.

¹ *Upodigma Neustriæ*, p. 217, R. S. He calls the envoy "Petrus de Flote, qui mandata regis constantissime coram Papa prosequabatur". This late author appears to be the only one who says that Pierre F. took Philip's letters to the Pope. As he was the chancellor, it is not likely in itself. He was probably too busy with the Flanders expedition, in which he was killed at Courtrai, July 11, 1302.

² It had been decided at Senlis that the King's messenger: "significabit (to the Pope) quod licet Rex . . . talem proditorem . . . posset et deberet statim, supplicio ipsum tradendo, de medio tollere regni sui . . . cum tantus reatus omne privilegium excludat, etc." See the doc. already cited, ap. Dupuy, p. 630.

³ So far the authentic document just quoted.

powers." Thereupon Peter retorted, "You may have; but your power is only one of words, whereas ours is real." Still further inflamed by this reply, Boniface declared that he would move heaven and earth against its author.¹

However "ben trovato" this story may be, and however it may have been blessed by modern historians, it is simply devoid of any evidence of credibility. It is founded, like so many other *historical* notices of the dispute between Boniface and Philip, on the latter's forged bull "Scire te volumus" to which reference will be made immediately.

Philip's
unbridled
attack on
Boniface,
1302.

When Philip found not merely from the bull "Ausculda" and the other documents of December 5, 1301,² but even from the Pope's letter of January 13, 1302, and the report of his envoy, that he was not to be allowed to deal with the bishop of Pamiers himself, and realized that his general conduct had been publicly condemned, he was furious, and determined on revenge. There was no longer any question of Bernard Saisset. He was released, and told to get out of the country along with James de Normannis as fast as possible,³ and the

¹ *L.c.*

² According to *Les grandes Chroniques*, c. 40, ed. P. Paris, v, p. 134, these letters were received by Philip in February; but that date is perhaps rather late.

³ *Les grandes C., l.c.*, p. 135; Will. de Nangis, 314, and his continuator, p. 329, whose words are repeated practically *verbatim* by the continuator of Gerard de Frachet, ap. *RR. FF. SS.*, xxi, p. 19. Note that both William de N., and *Les g. C.* rest on the forged bull "Scire te volumus". W. de N. says, *ib.*, p. 313, "Boniface in his letters patent told Philip 'quod volebat cum scire se et regnum suum, tam in spiritualibus quam in temporalibus, subesse R. B. pontificum ditioni.'" *Les g. C.* say, p. 134, that the P. told Phil. "que il vouloit qu'il sceut tant ès temporelles, etc." See also Villani, *Chron.*, viii, 62. The expulsion took place, Feb. 26. Cf. the *Diary* of Lawrence Martini, ap. Finke, *Aus d. Tagen*, pp. xliii and lv.

decree against the exportation of gold, etc., from France was at once renewed.¹ But at the same time Philip took much more radical action against the Pope. He determined to create a public opinion against him. Unable for this purpose to turn with effect against Boniface anything that he had said or really meant, he stooped to the lowest of methods—to forgery. Nothing that would tell against Boniface could be made out of the noble bull “Ausculta fili”, and so a gross caricature of it, admirable for its base purpose in its brevity and directness, was put in circulation.² It ran:—

“To Philip, King of the Franks. Fear God and keep His commandments. The forged bull “Scire te volumus”, 1302.

“We would have you know that you are subject to us in spirituals and in temporals. The collation of benefices and prebends does not pertain to you in any way, and if you have the custody of certain vacant benefices, it is for you to reserve the fruits of them for their successors. If you have conferred any such benefices, we declare such collation null and void, and we revoke any that have actually been given. We account heretics all who believe otherwise. Given at the Lateran, December 5 (1301), in the seventh year of our pontificate.”³ There is no need to waste words in proving that “Scire te volumus” is a forgery. With the real documents of December 5, 1301, from the Register of Boniface before us, its form and contents are more than sufficient to prove that it is not genuine, that it never came from the Pope nor from the Lateran. Its authenticity nowadays finds

¹ Ptolemy of Lucca, *Annales*, ap. *R. I. SS.*, xi, 1305; Jordanus, *Chron.*, ap. Muratori, *Antiq. Ital.*, iv, 1022–3.

² The forgery, according to the Pope, was the work of Pierre Flotte. Cf. his assertion, ap. Dupuy, p. 76.

³ Dupuy, p. 44; Baillet, with a French translation, p. 124 ff. “Scire te volumus.”

no defenders.¹ Nor again is it necessary to pause in order to show that Boniface never taught that, in the bald sense of the words, the King of France or any other temporal ruler was subject to him "in temporals as well as spirituals". On the contrary, like his predecessors, he taught plainly that "there were two powers (equally) ordained by God", but that Kings, like all other Christians, were subject to the spiritual power which was superior to the temporal power, and that consequently if they did wrong, they could be reprimanded by reason of that wrong (*ratione peccati*) like any other Christians.²

However "Scire" succeeded in irritating the ever unreflecting multitude. It had a great success! It furnished phrases for historians of the time; its pretensions were triumphantly scouted and refuted³; it was publicly burnt,⁴ and a reply to it in language as

¹ It is labelled a forgery in Potthast, ii, p. 2006. Boutaric, p. 106, observes that both Boniface and the cardinals denied its genuineness and he adds himself "le faux est évident"; and, in a note to this passage, that the style of the document is too much opposed to the usage of the Roman chancery to be authentic. Rocquain, *La Papauté*, p. 262, simply calls it "la fausse bulle"; Renan, *Études*, p. 262, says that Philip "substituted the false bull 'Scire' for the true one 'Ausculata'".

² See the replies of cardinals and the Pope to Philip's protests against the papal documents of Dec. 5, 1301, to be cited more fully presently, ap. Dupuy, p. 73 ff., especially pp. 75, 76.

³ By the advocate Pierre Dubois. See his *Deliberatio*, ap. Dupuy, p. 44 ff. Opinions differ as to whether he knew that the "Scire" which he so mangled was a forgery or not. Cf. his "De recuperatione terre Sancte", c. 111, al. 70, ed. Ch. Langlois with the notes thereto. F. M. Powicke regards P. D. as a "virulent royalist pamphleteer like Nogaret". "P. D., a mediaeval radical," ap. *Historical Essays*, ed. Tout and Tait, Manchester, 1902.

⁴ Cf. a note "from a manuscript" in Dupuy, p. 59. It was burnt in Paris to the sound of trumpets (Feb., 1302) "on the Sunday after the octave of Candlemas Day". See also the letter of card. Matteo Rosso to the duke of Burgundy, ap. *ib.*, p. 79 ff., Sept. 6, 1302. "Combustæ sunt Apostolicæ litteræ in ipsius Regis et magnatum præsentia"—a thing which, said the cardinal, not even pagans had ever done.

insolent as its own was drawn up; and, if not sent to Rome, at any rate made public. It ran thus:—

“ Philip, by the grace of God, King of the Franks; to Boniface who carries himself as Supreme Pontiff little or no greeting. An answer to
“ Scire ”.

“ Let your stupendous stupidity (*maxima fatuitas*) realize that in temporals we are not subject to anyone. The collation of vacant Churches and benefices, and their revenues (*fructus*) belong to us by royal right, and the collations we have actually made or shall make are to be accounted valid. We will defend their holders against everybody. Such as believe otherwise we account fools and madmen. Given at Paris.”¹

At this juncture we may repeat the words of the chronicler, Gilles de Muisit, a “ great controversy had now sprung up between the lord Pope and the lord King which increased day by day because fulminating letters were constantly being issued by both parties.”² But we may add that, whatever right Philip may have had to cut himself and his country out of the Christian commonwealth, and throw over any recognition of the Pope’s authority in temporal concerns, the methods he used to effect his purpose were to the last degree reprehensible.³ Moreover, in view of the efforts which all

Boniface also denounces the burning of his bull, *ap. ib.*, p. 90. In his reply to this charge Philip pretended that, in a private dispute, one of the parties had brought forward some *unauthentic* papal letters to prove his case, and afterwards had consented to their being destroyed, so that no insult to the Holy See was intended. *Ib.*, p. 94. Cf. Ptolemy of Lucca, *H. E.*, p. 1222, *Annals*, *ap. R. I. SS.*, xi, p. 1305, and Villani, viii, 62.

¹ Dupuy, p. 44.

² *Chronique*, p. 61.

³ This is freely conceded by Boutaric “ Jusque-là l’Europe occidentale avait formé une vaste république chrétienne, dont le pape était le chef suprême.” The Pope’s right of intervention in the affairs of Princes was then, he avers, “ universally recognized ”; and he acknowledges that Philip’s quarrel with Boniface to fix proper limits to the exercise of papal authority “ was accompanied by scandals and deplorable acts of violence ”. Pp. 88–9.

earnest men are now making to find a substitute for the moderating power of the Popes in Europe in the Middle Ages, we may conclude that, in the general interests of mankind, Philip's successes did more harm than good ; and that, *under the circumstances*, Boniface had more right on his side in his efforts to uphold a noble ideal than Philip had in his efforts to shatter it. Indeed, if the case between Boniface VIII. and Philip had come up before an impartial mediaeval judge, such as Chief Justice Sir John Fortescue, chancellor of Henry VI., there is no doubt whatever that Philip would barely have obtained a hearing. For "that Apostle of English constitutionalism", as he is called by Maitland, has stated categorically that there is no "kingedome of which the Kinge *in temporaltes* is subget to no man ; for *all Kynges* beth (are) membres of holy Chyrche, of which our holy fader the Pope is Vicare to Cryste as hede "

. . . Wherefore it follows "that any Kinge *to be not subget to any man* is impossible, sythen euery Kinge, as a membre of holy Chirch, is subject to the Pope".¹

Now that he had decided not to acknowledge the overlordship of the Pope in any way,² nor to allow him any right of interference in any of his temporal doings or misdoings, Philip and his agents or guides meanly struck at the Pope himself. In their efforts to rouse public feeling against Boniface, no time was lost. After the

An
assembly at
the Louvre,
March 12,
1302.

¹ Cited by F. W. Maitland, "Canon Law in England," ap. his *Collected Papers*, vol. iii, p. 155, London. He quotes from the Clermont ed. of Sir John's *Works*, pp. 534-5.

² How far that overlordship was generally recognized at this period we have an admirable example in the legal code, known as the *Siete Partidas* (finished 1265) of the absolutist Alfonso X. of Castile. It "recognized that one legitimate way of acquiring the crown was by a grant of the Pope, and that the latter might also absolve Castilian subjects from obedience to the King in certain cases". C. E. Chapman, *A Hist. of Spain*, p. 164, N. York, 1918.

circulation of the "Scire" forgery, a special assembly was convoked to meet at the Louvre on March 12, 1302. Besides the King himself, there were present at the meeting the archbishops of Sens and Narbonne, the bishops of Meaux, Nevers, and Auxerre, and a number of nobles, including Charles of Valois, Robert II., duke of Burgundy, the constable of France, "and many others specially convoked for this purpose."

The proceedings were opened by the most brutal of the men who at this time were directing the destinies of France, William of Nogaret, who is described as a knight and "venerable professor of law",¹ and by his critics as "a body without a soul, as a man who had not the slightest regard for anyone's rights, and was only concerned with filling the coffers of the King of France".² He began by saying that, in a prophetic spirit, St. Peter had written: "There were also false prophets among the people, even as there shall be among you lying teachers" (2 Peter, ii, 1). Such a teacher, in the style of Balaam, was the one now sitting in the chair of Blessed Peter "a master of lies, calling himself 'Good-doer' (Boniface), whereas he is 'Evil-doer' (Maleficus). So has he assumed a false name; and, though he is not a true president, still, as though he were, he now calls himself the lord, the judge, the master of all men." He then went on to assert that Boniface was no true Pope, he had entered the sheepfold like a thief and a robber when Pope Celestine, whom he had cajoled by his lies to desert his spouse the Church, was still alive. After much more mischievous trash, he gave a forecast of the violence

¹ "Nobilis vir d. G. de N. miles, legum professor venerabilis." Dupuy, p. 56.

² A report to James II. of Aragon: "Qui (W. of N.) est corpus sine anima, quia non curat de jure alicujus nisi de impinguando errarium d. regis Francie." Finke, *Mon. Ar.*, i, n. 307, p. 459.

which he was one day to use, and which appears to have even then been in contemplation.¹ Addressing the King he bade him, as the angel of the Lord did against Balaam, draw his sword against this "pestiferous man who is far worse than Balaam, so that he cannot inflict the evil on people which he intends".² He next declared that Boniface was a "manifest heretic", "the most horrible simoniac that the world had ever seen", and so covered "with an infinite number of enormous manifest crimes that, without the ruin of the Church, he can no longer be tolerated". After enumerating a respectable number of these infinitely numerous crimes, he called on Philip to summon a General Council to condemn "the above-mentioned most unspeakable man". Before that council he was ready to appear and prove what he had asserted, and he called upon the cardinals to elect a proper Pope, and meanwhile "to put the above-mentioned criminal (*flagitiosus*) in custody".

The
assembly at
Paris, Apr.,
1302.

Allowing a little time for the forgery "*Scire te volumus*", and the impudent abuse of Nogaret to work their poisonous effect, Philip took another move in the attack on the position of Pope Boniface. It was as astute as the other two, and carried out in the same illegal, not to say immoral, way as the others. Realizing to what the just indignation of Boniface would expose

¹ See a document of Oct. 17, 1303, ap. Dupuy, p. 174 ff., containing a letter from Philip dated March 7, 1302, and addressed to all parties concerned in which he says that he has commissioned Jean Mouschet, Will. de N., etc., to proceed "to certain parts on certain affairs of ours". Now it was "in the château of Staggia belonging to Mouchet that the enterprise against Boniface at Anagni was organized" (Boutaric, p. 107), and this letter was used by Nogaret to get help after the outrage at Anagni had been committed. See the next chapter.

² "Sic (i.e., after the mode of the Angel in the case of Balaam) dicto pestifero, qui longe pejor est dicto Balaam, vos . . . sicut Angelus Dei, . . . gladio evaginato occurrere velitis, ne possit malum populo perficere quod intendit." Ap. Dupuy, p. 57.

him when he had learnt what was in progress against him, the King strove to involve as many as possible in his doings.¹ He summoned the three estates of the realm to meet in Paris on April 10, 1302. This first certain union of the States-General of France was held in Nôtre Dame,² and, under the guidance of Pierre Flotte, its deliberations were managed with scandalous unfairness. The proceedings of the assembly began, we are told, by the reading of "the papal mandates—*mandata papalia*". What papal mandates? Apparently "*Scire te volumus*" or some other forgeries; for John of St. Victor, summing up the letters which were read, declares that among "many other things" they set forth that the King was subject to the Pope not only in matters spiritual, but also in matters temporal, to wit, that he held his realm of the Pope,³ and that no collation of vacant benefices appertained to him. That letters containing such statements must have been read, is clear from what William of Nangis relates of the sequence of the proceedings. When the letters had been read, all, "especially the prelates," were asked by Philip what had nothing to do with the question at issue, i.e., from whom they held their

¹ Döllinger, *Hist. of the Church*, iv, 88, after noting how the evil inclinations of Philip and his ministers were leading them to do all they could to cause a rupture, continues: "With artful calculation did Philip learn how to avert the effect of an interdict, should the Pope proceed to this extremity, and at the same time to increase the strength of his opposition by involving in the quarrel the three states of the kingdom."

² Will. de Nangis, i, pp. 314-15 (the chronicle of William Scot or of the monk, Ivo, writing under Gilles of Pontoise, abbot of St. Denis, ap. *RR. FF. SS.*, xxi, 204, adds nothing to W. of N.); John of St. Victor, ap. *ib.*, xxi, 638; and the *Chron. métrique* of Geoffrey of Paris, *ib.*, xxii, p. 91.

³ See the strong declaration of card. Matthew Acquasparta when news of this assembly had reached him that neither Pope nor cardinal had ever said: "*quod d. Rex deberet recognoscere regnum suum ab Ecclesia.*" Ap. Dupuy, p. 75.

temporalities or their fiefs. They all replied, from the King. Thereupon, Philip dramatically exclaimed: "Our ancestors held the Kingdom of France of God alone, and we are ready to spend ourselves, our treasure, all that we have to preserve intact the freedom of the realm. All who oppose us, and give heed to the decrees of the Roman Pontiff, we shall account as enemies alike of ourselves and of our kingdom." To this peroration there came by the mouth of count Robert of Artois the prompt reply of the barons that they were all ready to fight unto death for the crown of France against all its adversaries.¹

The barons
want the
cardinals to
provide a
remedy,
1302.

The official documents in connection with this assembly which have come down to us, to wit, letters to the cardinals and to the Pope, are in accord with the statements of the chroniclers in showing that it was not the true bull of Boniface, "Ausculta fili", that was put before it. The clergy and laity of France were played upon by forgeries or grossly unfair deductions from the Pope's real letters.² At any rate, the barons, properly indignant at what they had been informed were the Pope's ideas as to the temporal relations of the King of France towards himself, wrote to the cardinals. They would not, they declared, allow him who is now sitting on the chair of the Church to interfere in the government of a country which its King held of God and not of the Pope. They protested, moreover, against the bishops and masters of law going

¹ Will. de N., *l.c.* If it had not been done before, Philip now gave orders to guard all the passes that led to Italy and to prevent under severe penalties the taking there of any gold, silver, or any kind of merchandise. Cf. two anonymous chronicles, ap. *RR. FF. SS.*, xxii, pp. 18 and 24.

² Hence the barons of France inform the cardinals that the King had told them that, in his letters, the Pope had pretended that the Kingdom of France which all knew was in temporals subject to God only "il en devoit estre sujet à luy (the Pope) temporellement, et de luy devoit et doit tenir." Ep. Apr. 10, 1302, ap. Dupuy, p. 60. The bishops say the same to the Pope, ap. *ib.*, pp. 68 and 69.

to Rome. If they were to obey the summons of Boniface, the kingdom would be denuded of all that it had of what was most precious.¹ Then, turning the question of disorders on the Pope, they maintained that he was doing the work of antichrist in demanding such great sums for the collation of benefices, in giving benefices to unworthy persons, and in interfering with the rights of others in conferring certain benefices. They exhorted the cardinals to provide a remedy for these abuses, so that there would be an opportunity for considering the question of the Holy Land and other important measures. They finished their appeal to the cardinals by a declaration that even at the bidding of the King they would not change their views.²

The bishops and clergy also wrote to Boniface on the day of the assembly at Paris. But they were neither as ignorant nor as independent as the barons. Many, no doubt, knew that the assembly was misled by lies and forgeries, and all realized that they were in a very awkward position between the King and the Pope. All, however, or nearly all,³ pretended to believe to their great sorrow that the letters of Boniface which had been laid before the King and his barons, i.e., they are very careful to add, "before only a few of the barons," contained the phrase that the King was subject to the Pope in temporals, and ought to hold his realm of the Pope.⁴

The bishops
of France to
Boniface,
Apr. 10,
1302.

¹ Cf. the same futile reasons advanced by envoys whom Philip sent to the cardinals. Cf. Eberhard, *Chron.*, ap. *M. G. SS.*, xvii, 599.

² *Ib.*

³ The French historian, Bernard Guidonis, *Chron.*, ap. *R. F. S.*, xxi, p. 713, speaks with no little sarcasm of the poor figure cut by "columns of the Church" at this juncture: "Multi autem qui videbantur esse columpnæ ecclesiæ, metu aut odio aut quocumque motu alio sunt concussi, et pauci inventi sunt qui constanter steterint in aperto."

⁴ See their letter, ap. Dupuy, p. 67 ff. "Inspectis Apostolicis literis clausis ei (the King) . . . et quibusdam, licet paucis, Baronibus, etc.," p. 68. Nor do the clergy say that the Pope's letters were shown and

They then proceeded to tell the Pope how the King and the lay nobility had been very much provoked by these unheard-of assertions, and more or less on the same lines as the barons, to unfold to him all that had taken place at the assembly. They had been informed, too, that the Pope had summoned them before him to help him to reform the Kingdom. But though they had tried to pacify the King by assuring him that the intention of His Holiness was not what it seemed to be,¹ and though they had asked to be allowed to obey his orders,² the King had refused to allow them to leave the kingdom. For the sake, therefore, of preserving the long-standing close union between the Kingdom of France and the Roman Church, they implored the Pope to revoke his mandate summoning them to Rome.³

A consistory
in Rome,
June 25,
1302.

When these letters of the bishops and barons were received, and word of what had passed in Paris reached Boniface, he at once held a consistory; and, through Dupuy, we know something of the deliberations that took place at it. Cardinal Acquasparta expressed his inability to understand the commotion in France. The

read to the assembly. They only say that they were informed of what was said in the letters, and by the Pope's nuncio, James de Normannis.

¹ Somewhat more than a century later this was strongly reaffirmed by one of France's very greatest churchmen, John Gerson. Speaking to the Greeks on the subject of reunion he declared "We ought not to affirm that Kings hold their dominions from the Pope . . . as some pretend was asserted by Boniface VIII. Nevertheless, all men, including princes, are subject to the Pope, in so far as they may abuse their temporal jurisdiction and power by offences against the law of God and nature. This papal superiority should be called directive rather than civil or juridical." "Serm. de unione Græcorum," ap. *Opp.*, iv, p. 600, ed. Paris, 1606.

² "Eidem d. Regi humiliter supplicantes ut, cum Apostolicæ sanctitati ad obedientiam teneamur, ad beatitudinis vestræ pedes . . . permitteret nos transferre." *Ib.*, p. 70.

³ "Prospiciatur nobis, nostrisque statibus, revocando vestræ vocationis edictum." *Ib.*, p. 71.

Pope and the cardinals were quite at one in their view of the condition of ecclesiastical affairs in that country.¹ They knew that the Pope had written a letter of remonstrance in a very kindly spirit to Philip, and it had been discussed by them²; but they knew nothing of any letter about the King having to hold his temporalities of the Pope. The King was being led astray by evil counsellors. What had he to fear from those who were his friends being summoned for a brief space to Rome which was not at the end of the universe? With regard to benefices, lay persons might have the right of presentation, but not of collation.

He was ready to lay down his life for the truth that the Pope, who is the Vicar of Blessed Peter, has from Christ, the Lord of the World, the plenitude of power. He is the only helmsman in the Church which is the barque of Christ and Peter. Hence he has the plenitude of power in matters spiritual, and even in matters temporal he has power when men do wrong (*ratione peccati*). There are two powers. The Pope has spiritual jurisdiction; Emperors and Kings temporal. The exercise of temporal jurisdiction does not belong to the Pope. The King of France, therefore, has no cause of complaint.³ Let him then cease from his attacks on the Church, and remain its good son.

In his turn, Boniface addressed (but probably not exactly in the words of the existing French report of his speech) the assembled cardinals and the bishops who had come

¹ "Dicam veritatem . . . quia in Collegio inter summum Pontificem qui est caput nostrum, et inter Fratres nulla est dissensio, nulla diversitas, nulla divisio." *Ib.*, p. 74.

² Calling the "*Ausculda fili*" a secret letter, he says that "fuit ad consistorium pluries deportata, fuit lecta, relecta, diligenter examinata." *Ib.*, p. 75.

³ "Jurisdictio temporalis, quantum ad usum et quantum ad executionem actus non competit ei (the Pope) . . . unde videtur modo quod Rex Francorum non habet materiam conquerendi." *Ib.*, p. 76.

as the bearers of their brethren's letters. Justly angry at the low tricks, quite without precedent, which a King and his advisers had played upon him, he spoke with no little heat. He began by pointing out what the Kings of France had gained by their union with the Church. In the days of "the Great Philip" (Philip Augustus), the King of France had only a revenue of eighteen thousand pounds, whereas to-day, by the support of the Church, he has more than forty thousand.¹ But mischief is now being made between the King and the Church "by a diabolical person whom God has already punished in part—a man blind in body and mind, to wit, Pierre Flotte, a poisonous man who is to be accounted a heretic and condemned as such". His satellites are the count of Artois, once our friend, whose character is known to all, and the count of St. Pol. *That* Pierre falsified our letter which had been drawn up with the greatest care with the help of the whole College of Cardinals, and in conjunction with the King's envoys,² or at any rate (for, as our letters were kept from the bishops and barons, we do not know precisely what he did) he made us say that we had required that the King should acknowledge that he received his kingdom from us. "For forty years have we been thoroughly acquainted with the Canon Law, and well we know that there are two powers ordained of God. Who then can believe that such a crassly stupid notion is or ever has been entertained by us?"

"We have no desire to usurp the King's rights, but we

¹ This statement about the revenue of the French Kings is quite wrong, and is one of the reasons which have induced Boutaric (p. 113) to deny the authenticity of the document (fifteenth century) which gives this address of Boniface.

² "Iste Petrus literam nostram, quam de consensu . . . (et) . . . repetita deliberatione totius Collegii et *ex conventionem et convento habito cum nunciis regiis* . . . ex eo quod dixerant nobis prius scribatur . . . falsavit, seu falsa de ea confixit, etc.," p. 77.

do say that he, like any other of the faithful, is subject to us where there is question of fault (*ratione peccati*).” As for the collation of benefices, the law forbids their collation by laymen. But we are only anxious with regard to benefices and tithes that the King should do lawfully what he is doing unlawfully; and therefore, in this matter, have we shown our wish to grant him all kinds of privileges. We, on our side, are accused of excesses. Well, let the King send some of his barons to us, provided they are good men, like the duke of Burgundy or the count of Brittany, and let them show us in what we have exceeded, and we will remedy the disorders.¹

Boniface would have the King recall how much he had done to save him from the English and the Germans, but he would not have the King drive him to the wall. He knew the secrets of his kingdom, and how much the King is loved by the Germans and the men of Languedoc and Burgundy! “Our predecessors have deposed three Kings of France; and, we say it with sorrow, we are ready to depose one like a groom (*garcio*)”² should he continue his present policy, and prevent the bishops from coming to us. We are weak and old; and so, instead of summoning the bishops of the whole world, we have merely summoned the King’s friends. If they do not come, we will depose them. The wrathful Pontiff finished his address by bidding the French bishops attend another consistory on the morrow, say anything they had to say, and receive the answer to the letters they had brought.

¹ Cf. a repetition of this offer of arbitration by Boniface, which at one time Philip professed his readiness to accept. Cf. his ep. of Apr. 13, 1303, ap. Dupuy, p. 96. The King’s consent to their arbitration is to be seen *ib.*, p. 95.

² Ep. “*Verba delirantis filiæ*,” ap. Dupuy, p. 65. He bade them understand: “*quod obedientes gratiose videbimus, et contumaces, pro qualitate inobedientiæ, puniemus.*”

Renewed
summons of
the French
bishops to
Rome, June
26, 1302.

On the following day, the French bishops in Rome duly received a letter from Boniface to their brethren the whole clergy of France. It was full of excuses for their conduct. He knew how they had been threatened; how they had been misled, especially by that half-blind son of Belial, Pierre Flotte; and how the assembly was rushed. Still they ought not, through fear of temporal loss, to have allowed their mother, the Church, to be abused as it had been. In fine he bade them fear naught and come to him.¹

On the same day, the cardinals sent off their reply to the communication of the French nobility. It was to the same effect as the discourse of cardinal Acquasparta before the Consistory. The Pope had never said that the King was subject to him in temporals, and ought to hold his kingdom from him. The statement of Pierre Flotte was false. It was considerate on the part of the Pope to have summoned only the clergy of France. If he had summoned the clergy of the world, many would have come who would have been hostile to the King of France. As for the Pope's "provisions" of which they complained, he has hardly given one to a foreigner; but, through him, many a poor scholar has been able to procure the pearl of learning.² The cardinals finally

¹ In reading this sentence, at once rude and historically inaccurate, one cannot help recalling the fact that Dupuy drew this document from a French source—a non-contemporary manuscript of St. Victor, of the origin of which we know nothing. Has the original French writer fairly reported the Pope's words? Boutaric (p. 113) denies the authenticity of the document altogether. Others, perhaps more wisely, believe that it is certainly not authentic in its entirety.

² Over this the cardinals rise to touching eloquence: "*Quis unquam prædecessorum suorum formas providendi pauperibus clericis plus extendit, quibus per nonnullos ex Prælati non fiebat provisio, et mendicare quodammodo cogebantur in opprobrium clericale? Exurgant cum ipso Domino Magistri in Theologia, quibus ipse in Parisien. Ecclesia canonicatus contulit et præbendas; exurgant magistri et alii literati et in acie stent cum ipso qui, paupertate gravati, multis sudoribus . . . adepti sunt scientiæ margaritam, et dicam quomodo*

expressed their pained surprise that in their letter the nobles did not speak of their Holy Father as the Supreme Pontiff, but alluded to him in quite a disrespectful style. As a Parthian shot, they begged the barons to see that they got a "*good and faithful*" interpreter of their letter.

As sole rejoinder to these solid arguments, Philip renewed his decree against the exportation of gold and war materials from France, and added to it an express prohibition for any ecclesiastical or civil dignitary to leave the kingdom without his express permission.¹

Bishops forbidden to leave France, 1302.

Philip, undaunted even by the terrible defeat of Courtrai (July 11, 1302), was evidently resolved on a fight to the finish. Various cardinals, however, tried to avoid extremities by calling on Robert, duke of Burgundy, to mediate between the Pope and the King of France. Cardinal Matteo Rosso, for instance, after briefly enumerating the favours which Boniface had granted Philip, and the ungrateful return which the King had made him,² implored the duke to approach his overlord—who had certainly incurred excommunication by endeavouring to prevent the bishops from obeying the Pope's summons³—and try to induce him to acknowledge his faults (Sept. 6). Though other cardinals also approached the duke, he could do nothing.⁴ Philip was

Peace and war efforts.

illorum pietas, ad quos beneficiorum collatio pertinebat, respexit eosdem." Ap. Dupuy, p. 64. Seventeen cardinalitial seals in red wax were appended to this letter. See the similar one which the cardinals addressed to the Third Estate, *ib.*, p. 71.

¹ Ap. Dupuy, p. 86. See also Eberhard of Ratisbon, *Chron.*, ap. *M. G. SS.*, xvii, p. 599.

² Among other ways, by the disgraceful burning of the Pope's letters: "*dulcedine plenæ, paterna caritate respersæ.*" Ep. ap. Dupuy, p. 80.

³ "*Nonne certum est ipsum Regem excommunicationis sententiam incurrisse . . . promulgatam publice contra eos qui impediunt ad Sedem (apostolicam) venientes.*" *Ib.*, p. 81.

⁴ See their letter about the same time (Sept. 5), ap. *ib.*, p. 82.

obstinate. He even withdrew his acceptance of Boniface as the private mediator between himself and Edward of England.¹

Both Pope
and King
seek allies,
1302.

Meanwhile, both the Pope and the King were striving to secure the sympathy or support of other independent rulers, as we learn from a letter of Philip to James II. of Aragon. But though the French King tried to stir up the Aragonese monarch by assuring him that the Pope would strive to subject him in temporal matters as he was striving to subject France,² he made no progress with him. James merely replied that he was much distressed at the discord between the Pope and the King, considering on the one hand his respect for the Roman Church, and on the other his relationship with Philip.³

The
assembly at
Rome, Nov.

Besides failing with James II., the French King failed also to some considerable extent with his bishops. On the appointed November 1, despite his threats and prohibitions, four archbishops, thirty-five bishops⁴ (including the exiled Bernard Saisset), along with a number of doctors and abbots, presented themselves before the Pope.⁵

¹ *Ib.*, p. 84, Nov. 8, 1302.

² "Datum est intelligi ipsi regi (Philip), quod papa . . . nititur regem ipsum et regnum in temporalibus sibi subicere." *Ap. Finke, Mon. Arag.*, i, p. 120, Sept., 1302.

³ *Ap. ib.*, p. 121.

⁴ *Les grandes Chron. de France*, c. 46, vol. v, p. 147, is then much mistaken in saying that the bishops did not go to Rome at this time.

⁵ A list of the bishops present is given, *ap. Dupuy*, p. 86. *Cf. B. Guidonis*, *ap. R. I. SS.*, iii, pt. i, p. 672; and Peter of Lodève, † 1311, or the author of the *Præclara Francorum facinora*, p. 400. We quote from the French version in Guizot's *Collect. des Mémoires*, xv, *Histoire de la guerre des Albigeois*, Paris, 1824. This chronicle is really taken from the *Flores Chronicorum* or *Vitæ Pont. Rom.* of Bernard Guidonis, † 1331, who was also bp. of Lodève. This chronicle also mentions the burning of the Pope's bull, and asserts that it was owing to the sums of money which were spent by Philip that Boniface was unable to master him; for, it adds, several of the great bishops, thinking only of their own interests, deserted the Pope.

We do not, indeed, know the details of this memorable assembly, but various acts, especially the famous bull "Unam Sanctam" which, no doubt, emanated from it, have come down to us. One of these documents shows us that the memory of the forger, Pierre Flotte (for he, along with Robert of Artois, had perished at Courtrai) was condemned, and his clerical sons deprived of all their ecclesiastical dignities and emoluments.¹ But no condemnation was passed on Philip. Acting, doubtless, on the advice of the French bishops, the Pope did nothing which aimed at France in particular. In order, however, to make the situation plain, he set forth the claims of the Church as understood in his day, in unmistakable language. He issued the famous bull "Unam Sanctam" (Nov. 18, 1302),² in order that Philip might not be able to pretend ignorance as to his position and duties as a King in the Christian Commonwealth, and as one of the faithful in the Church Catholic.

"In perpetual memory of the affair.

The bull
"Unam
Sanctam,"
Nov., 1302.

"By our faith, we are forced to believe and maintain one holy Catholic and Apostolic Church. This we firmly believe, and we confess simply that out of it there is no salvation, nor remission of sins, for the spouse in the Canticles declared 'One is my dove, my perfect one is but one, she is the only one of her mother, the chosen of her that bore her' (*Cant.*, vi, 8). This represents the one mystical body of which the head is Christ—the God in Christ, and in which there is one Lord, one faith, and one baptism (*Eph.*). In the days of the deluge there was but one

¹ *Reg.*, n. 4847, Nov. 5, 1302.

² *Reg.*, n. 5382, Dupuy, p. 54. The bull is not dated in Dupuy. Attention may be called to the importance of dates in this controversy. It has very often been wrongly presented from want of this attention. I have based my translation of *U.S.* on the authentic text of the Register; but I find, by comparing the two, that the text of Dupuy is practically accurate.

ark, that of Noah (typifying the one Church) which . . .¹ held but one helmsman and captain, to wit Noah ; and we read that everything on the earth outside the ark perished. This one Church do we revere, and (we pray) with the Lord in the words of the prophet : ‘ Deliver, O God, my soul from the sword, my only one from the clutch of the dog ’ (Ps. xxi, 21). He prayed at one and the same time for his soul, i.e., for Himself, the Head, and for his body. Now it is the one Church that he called his body, by reason of the unity of spouse, faith, the Sacraments, and love of the Church. She is that tunic of the Lord which ‘ was without seam, woven from the top throughout ’ (S. John, xix, 23) which was not cut, but for which lots were cast. Of this one and only Church, therefore, there is only one body and one head, not two heads as if it were a monster, and that one head is Christ and the vicar of Christ, Peter, and his successors; for the Lord said to Peter : ‘ Feed my sheep ’ (S. John xxi, 17). He said ‘ my sheep ’, speaking of all of them, not these or those sheep in any particular sense. We must then understand that all were committed to him. Should then Greeks or others contend that they have not been committed to the charge of Peter and his successors, they thereby declare that they are not Christ’s sheep, for He said by St. John that there ‘ shall be one fold and one shepherd ’ (x, 16).

“ In the power of this Church, so we are told in the Gospel, are two swords, the spiritual and the temporal.² For when the apostles said : ‘ Here are two swords ’ (S. Luke xxii, 38), (we must understand) that, as Apostles

¹ The words we have omitted “ in uno cubito consummata ” “ made according to one measure ” (or “ being finished in one cubit ”, as it has been translated), are decidedly obscure.

² It appears to have been St. Bernard (*De consideratione*, lib. iv, c. 3, n. 7), who popularized this mystical interpretation of the two swords. Cf. Baudrillart, p. 208.

were speaking, there was question of the Church, and (remember) that the Lord did not reply that they were too many, but that they were enough. He who would deny that the temporal sword is in Peter's power, but ill takes note of the Lord's words : ' Put up again thy sword into its place ' (S. Matt. xxvi, 52). Both swords, then, belong to the Church, the spiritual and the material, the latter to be used for the Church, the former by it. The former, too, is in the priest's own hands, the latter in those of Kings and soldiers to be employed under the direction of the priest. Sword must be under sword, and the temporal authority under the spiritual. For when the Apostle said ' There is no power but from God ; and those that are, are ordained of God ' (Rom. xiii, 1), they would not be so ordained were not sword subject to sword, and the material one, as the inferior, raised to high place by the spiritual one. For, according to the Blessed Dionysius, it is God's law that the inferior be raised up by the superior. It is not in accordance with the law of the Universe that things should be put in place directly and immediately, but always the lower is put into position by the higher, the inferior by the superior. Now, that the spiritual power excels the temporal in dignity and nobility, is as clear as that things spiritual excel things temporal. It is equally clear from the reception of tithes, the imparting of blessing and sanctification, by the acceptance of this very power, and by the government of things themselves.¹ The voice of truth tells us that it is

¹ What is the precise meaning of this sentence is not clear. Mury, *La bulle U.S.*, p. 108, n., does not throw light on it by showing that it is taken word for word from Gilles of Rome, *De eccles. potestate*, c. 4. However, here is the original : " Quod (the superiority of the spiritual power) etiam ex decimarum datione, et benedictione et sanctificatione, ex ipsius potestatis acceptione, ex ipsarum rerum gubernatione claris oculis intuemur." Ægidius Romanus in his turn merely repeated Hugh of St. Victor, *De sacrament.*, L. ii, pt. ii, c. 4, cited by Mury.

the business of the spiritual power to institute, to establish (*instituere*) the temporal power ; and, if it is not in order, to judge it. Hence in the case of the Church and the ecclesiastical power is verified that of the prophet Jeremiah : ‘ Lo I have set thee this day over the nations and over the kingdoms, etc.’ (i, 10). If then the temporal power errs, it is to be judged by the spiritual ; and if a lesser spiritual power errs it is to be judged by its superior. But if the supreme spiritual power should err, it can only be judged by God and not by men ; for the Apostle says : ‘ The spiritual man judges all things ; and he himself is judged of no man ’ (I Cor. ii, 15). This power, then, although given to a man and exercised by a man, is not so much human as divine. It was given by God’s word to Peter himself and to his successors in that same Christ whom he, the confirmed rock, confessed. To that same Peter did the Lord say : ‘ Whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth it shall be bound also in heaven ’ (S. Matt. xvi, 19). Whosoever, then, resists this power thus by God established, resists the ordinance of God, unless indeed, as Manes pretended, there are two principles (or first beginnings). But this we know is false and heretical ; for Moses testified that : ‘ In the beginning (not in the beginnings) God created heaven and earth ’ (Gen. i, 1). Accordingly, we declare, affirm, and define as a truth necessary for salvation that every human being is subject to the Roman Pontiff.¹ Given at the

¹ For some reason this phrase shocks some people. But every Christian who believes that Christ founded a Church, must believe that it was His intention that all should enter and obey that Church ; and, as Catholics believe and have always believed that the Pope is the head of Christ’s Church, it was only natural that a Pope in the thirteenth century should say what all Christians would then have said. He only declared what our own great bishop Grosseteste had said : “ The whole human race ” owes obedience to the Pope. Ep. 35, p. 123, *R. S.*

Lateran on the fourteenth of the Calends of December in the eighth year of our pontificate."

A few days after this bull was signed, John Monachus, cardinal-priest of SS. Marcellinus and Peter, was commissioned to convey it to Philip (Nov. 24). He was given very extensive powers,¹ among others, authority to absolve Philip from the excommunication into which he had fallen, if he showed any signs of repentance²; and had been chosen because, as a Frenchman who had once been bishop of Arras, he was thought to be *persona grata* to the King.³ He was also furnished with a list of grievances which he had to lay before Philip.⁴

But whether cardinal John had ever been on friendly terms or not with the King, as soon as he had arrived in France and had delivered his message, he was, as he told the Pope on his return to him, treated in a way utterly unbecoming an ambassador. He was surrounded with guards, so that he could not go about freely as he listed, nor receive those who came to see him. Nor in fine was he allowed to leave France without the King's permission. In the cardinal's own words, he was treated as if he had been an outlaw under the King's ban.⁵

Meanwhile the French King, incensed that, despite his orders, so many of the bishops of his realm had gone to the Pope, ordered their goods to be confiscated.⁶

Mission of
card. John
Monachus.

Dishonour-
able treat-
ment of the
Pope's
nuncio.

"Ad
interim"
action of
Philip, Nov.-
Dec., 1302.

¹ *Reg.*, nn. 5041-69.

² *Ib.*, n. 5068.

³ See the last bull of Boniface, "*Super Petri solio*" of Sept. 8, 1303, ap. Dupuy, p. 184; and read the same bull to see how badly he was treated by Philip.

⁴ They will be found with the King's replies to them, ap. *ib.*, p. 89 ff.

⁵ "*Et sic, quodammodo, ut ejus cardinalis verbis utamur, regio banno suppositum protulit et efflavit eundem.*" Ep. of Sept. 8, 1303, ap. Dupuy, p. 184, or *Bullar. Rom.*, iv, 172. In Dupuy we find "*pertulit*" for "*protulit*".

⁶ Decree of Nov. 21, 1302, ap. Dupuy, p. 83. "*Sub certis semel et iterum formis districti duxerimus prohibendum: ne quis de incolis regni . . . exire præsumeret, etc.*"

Then, without waiting for any official documents from the November synod to reach him, but merely acting on reports of it (perhaps, among others, the report of the Pope's address we have already cited) which had reached him,¹ he sent word to the Prelates and Barons of the kingdom to come to Paris with all speed, in order to take counsel with him on the news he had received from Rome.

Cardinal
John before
Philip, 1303.

What advice Philip, on this occasion, got from his barons and the bishops who had remained in France, can only be conjectured from the King's subsequent action. Cardinal John Monachus presented himself before him in the beginning of February,² and, in accordance with his instructions, informed him of the points on which the Pope sought redress. He was asked to recall his prohibition anent the bishop's going to Rome, and to recognize that the Pope has the supreme power of appointing to benefices, and of dealing with ecclesiastical goods and persons—apart from fiefs which are held of the King, and that the Pope can send legates and nuncios whenever he pleases. He was to leave the spiritual sword in the hands of the clergy, not to interfere with the city of Lyons, make restitution for the false money he had issued which had ruined France, and make amends for having burnt a papal bull. If satisfaction on these points were not made by the King, spiritual and temporal proceedings would have to be taken against him.³

To the Pope's points, Philip gave a series of evasive answers.⁴ The forbidding of gold, war material, or persons leaving the kingdom was a mere war measure.

¹ "Nova nobis de Romana curia noviter advenerunt, etc." Summons of Dec. 1, 1302, ap. *ib.*, p. 85.

² "Jehan le Moine . . . à Paris au commencement du mois de quaresme vint." *Grandes chroniques*, c. 46, vol. v, p. 147.

³ Ap. Dupuy, p. 90 ff.

⁴ Ap. *ib.*, p. 92 ff.

The bishops who had transgressed his orders could return and recover their property. With regard to the collation of benefices, he had merely followed long established customs; and, unless they were "suspect" for some good reason, he had no objection to the Pope's nuncios coming to France. As for dealing with church property and ecclesiastics, he only intended to follow law and custom. In the matter of the burning of the papal bull, merely an unauthentic one had been burned in a local dispute, and there was no thought of any insult to the Pope. The necessary defence of the realm had been the cause of the debasement of the coinage, but, on the complaint of his subjects, he was going to provide a speedy remedy for this abuse. In the Lyons trouble, the archbishop was to blame; but still the King was ready so to act that all would see that he was content with his own, and had no desire to usurp anyone's rights. Should the Pope not be content with these replies, he was prepared to agree to his suggestion, and to refer the matters in question to the dukes of Burgundy and Brittany.

Such a string of palpable evasions did not satisfy Boniface. It was probably never meant that they should do anything but gain time, so as to give forgery and misrepresentation further opportunities of inflaming public opinion against the Pope. But Boniface had no intention of granting more time than he could help. He made use of the custom long in vogue that enemies of the Holy See should be denounced publicly on Holy Thursday, to proclaim on that day (Apr. 4, 1303) that anyone, were he an emperor or a king, who should interfere with persons going to or coming from the Apostolic See was by the very act excommunicated. Notice of the decree was to be affixed to the doors of the Lateran basilica.¹

The Pope
not satisfied
with the
King's
replies.

¹ *Reg.*, n. 5345.

A little over a week later, he wrote to the nuncio in France to say that he believed that, if Philip would but think of all the Holy See had done for him, he would cease ill-using the Church and his people. With his brethren, the cardinals, he had carefully considered the King's replies, and could not be satisfied with them. Some of them, carefully examined in our presence, by skilled doctors in theology, and in canon and civil law, have been declared not to be in accordance with truth and justice. Others are ambiguous. They are not the sort of answers which Peter, bishop of Auxerre, and the King's brother, Charles of Alençon (generally spoken of as Charles of Valois), gave us to understand would be given. However, that our sincerity in these matters may be the more evident to all, we are ready to take counsel upon them with the magnates of the King's realm, especially with the dukes of Burgundy and Brittany. We are not afraid openly to discuss those points "for which if need be, we are *prepared to suffer martyrdom*".¹ He would be very glad if the said dukes would come to him, so that they might get to understand one another's point of view. Cardinal John was in fine instructed to approach the King, and to strive to induce him to give satisfactory replies to the points in question. Otherwise, he was to state, in the Pope's name, that he would proceed against him spiritually and temporally. He was then to return with all speed to report what had been done.²

¹ "Non enim erubescimus ea in lucem deducere pro quibus, si opus esset, martirium subiremus." *Reg.*, n. 5341, or Dupuy, p. 95, Apr. 13, 1303.

² This strong but dignified letter was, by order of Clement V., erased from the Register of Boniface. Digard has printed it in his edition of the Register from other copies preserved in Paris and Rome. Charles of Valois and Pierre de Mornay, bishop of Auxerre, were written to in the same sense. *Reg.*, 5344, or Dupuy, p. 97, Apr. 13, 1303.

By another letter of the same date, the cardinal was instructed to order those bishops who had not yet obeyed the Pope's summons to Rome, to do so within three months, under pain of deposition. The archbishops of Sens and Narbonne and a few bishops were specifically named as being bound to appear in person ; while others, as the archbishop of Rouen, are mentioned as excused from appearing by reason of ill-health or old age.¹

The absentee bishops to come to Rome, 1303.

The most momentous letter, however, dispatched to cardinal John Monachus on this eventful April 13, 1303, was the one which began : " Per processus nostras." ■ This bull or brief declared that, in virtue of decrees issued by Boniface himself and his predecessors, it was clear that Philip had incurred excommunication by preventing bishops from obeying a papal summons to Rome.³ Philip had refused the offer of absolution which had been made to him, so that there was nothing left but that the excommunication which he had incurred should be publicly announced.

Philip is found to be excommunicated.

If further peaceful diplomatic relations were, under the circumstances, impossible, and it was necessary to proceed against the French King, Boniface could not well have acted in a less offensive manner. He kept the personal element out of his action as much as possible, and left a comparatively easy line of retreat open to Philip. But of retreat the King had never had any thought. This Boniface knew full well, and took steps to prepare for a continued struggle. He strove to isolate Philip. He could count on the hostility of the Flemings

Efforts to isolate Philip.

¹ *Reg.*, n. 5343, Apr. 13, 1303. This letter was treated in the same way as the above. Digard edited it from the original preserved in Paris.

■ *Reg.*, n. 5342, or Dupuy, p. 98. This document was also erased from the Register, and edited in the same way as n. 5343.

³ " Unde ipsum regem, sic ligatum, a communione fidelium, et sacramentorum perceptione nunciamus exclusum, et per te vel alium seu alios precipimus nunciari." *Ib.*

to their oppressor. He was sure, as we have seen, of the goodwill of James of Aragon,¹ and in the very month in which he declared that Philip had incurred excommunication, he contrived to break the alliance between him and Albert of Austria by recognizing the latter as King of the Romans.² Nor is it doubtful that he would have been able to move our King Edward against him, had not Philip agreed at last to yield up Gascony to him (May 20, 1303). In any case, he knew that Edward would not give any help to the French King against him.³

Philip's
assembly of
June 13-14,
1303.

To this state of things Philip was not blind, and he resolved to go to extremes. And this he could the more easily do, as the chivalry of France had perished at Courtrai, leaving the way more clear for his lawyers, of whom France was full.⁴

There was nothing new in the bull "Unam Sanctam".⁵ Its principles had been previously proclaimed, not only by Boniface himself,⁶ but by his predecessors for centuries. They were generally accepted in Christendom.⁷ But it

¹ Under this year (1303), the *Annals of Colmar* (ap. Böhmer, *Fontes*, ii, p. 42), write: "Rex Arragonum composuit cum Papa, et misit ei cathedram auream et aureum scabellum ei fideliter copulato."

² *Supra*, p. 127 ff.

³ *Ib.*, p. 288.

⁴ "Si se pert la chevalerie
Et demore hoqueterie
En France a tout plain d'avoquas."

Geoffroi de Paris, v. 1783 ff., ap. *RR. FF. SS.*, xxii, p. 106.

⁵ This is acknowledged by writers of all shades of opinion; e.g., by Gregorovius, *Rome*, v, p. 575, note; Jervis, *A Hist. of the Ch. of France*, i, 66.

⁶ With the bull "Perlato pridem" cited above, p. 142; cf. "Apostolica Sedes" of May 13, 1300, to the duke of Saxony, ap. Theiner, *Cod. Dip.*, i, p. 371, n. 547. "Apostolica sedes divinitus constituta super Reges . . . cui omnis anima quasi sublimiori preeminencie debet esse subjecta, etc."

⁷ The doctrine of the "two swords" is set forth very precisely by John of Salisbury in the twelfth century. See his *Policraticus*, iv, 3.

could be treated in the same way as "Clericis laicos". It could be represented as addressed specially to France; it could be made out that it taught that in temporal affairs its King was dependent on the Pope,¹ and that the concluding phrase of the bull, the phrase which subjected "every creature to the Roman pontiff" meant nothing more or less than that every civil government had to act in accordance with the dictates of Rome. Such, in fact, were the conclusions drawn from it by Philip and his counsellors, and diligently circulated.

Accordingly, when he had received the bull "Unam Sanctam", and the notice that he was under sentence of excommunication, he called to Paris "archbishops, bishops, abbots, and priors of the military Orders, counts, and barons, and very many other persons secular and regular".²

If his summons was general, it did not receive a very hearty response; and there assembled at the Louvre a smaller number of bishops than had appeared before Boniface.³ The slaughter of Courtrai may explain the

His teaching is well set forth by R. W. and A. J. Carlyle in their most excellent and valuable work: *Mediaeval Political Theory in the West*, vol. iv, p. 333. Occasionally certain mediaeval authors styled the Pope "verus imperator", and called the Emperor his vicar; but "it is clear that this judgment does not correspond with that of the Decretals" (*ib.*, ii, 224), nor with that of Boniface himself.

¹ Accordingly, among the innumerable charges brought against Boniface, after his death, by his worthless enemies, was the false assertion that the bull "Unam Sanctam" finished thus: "concludebat (the said bull) quod omnes qui dicerent se Romano Pontifici non esse temporaliter etiam et in temporalibus subjectos, judicabat hæreticos." Dupuy, charge 13, p. 335. Elsewhere, in another charge (65, ap. *ib.*, p. 358), it was urged that Boniface had drawn up the said bull to show that all the French were heretics.

² The account of this meeting is given in Dupuy, p. 101 ff.

³ Comparing, in Dupuy, p. 86 with p. 108, it appears that 39 bps. and archbps. obeyed the summons of Boniface, and only 26 that of the King. This fact is studiously concealed by not a few writers.

insignificant attendance of the French nobility ; and also why the proceedings of this assembly resembled the unrestrained ones at the Louvre gathering of March 12, 1302, of which William of Nogaret was the presiding genius, and not the more dignified ones of the Notre Dame assembly of April 10. The fact, however, appears to be that the summons was not general, and that this assembly was a carefully selected one, and that only such prelates and barons were summoned as were supposed to be more or less King's men.¹

Charges
brought
against
Boniface.

In the presence of "the most serene prince Philip, by the grace of God, King of France", his son Louis, Guy, count of St. Pol, and William de Plaisan came forward and said that, animated solely by their zeal for the faith and their love for the Holy Roman Church, they wished to see it presided over by a legitimate pastor, and not by one so stained with heresies and sins as Boniface. These crimes of his, they declared, were enormous and public, were believed by them, and could be proved.² The King "as the champion (pugil) of the faith and the defender of the Church" and the prelates who were present, were next called upon to promote the calling of a General Council.

But the bishops, saying that the whole question was one of the greatest difficulty, said that they must have time to consider it, and retired to deliberate among themselves.

¹ Hence Rocquain, *La Papauté*, p. 272, declares emphatically that the name of "States General" could not be given to the assembly of June 13. It was really a "packed" meeting ; though Rocquain puts it more diplomatically : "Philippe jugea plus prudent d'obtenir l'assentiment d'une assemblée qu'il savait lui être dévouée, et d'agir ensuite sur le pays."

² "Jurantes . . . se præmissa omnia et singula (i.e., the "diversa, horribilia et detestabilia crimina" of which they accused Boniface) credere esse vera et posse probari." *Ib.*, p. 102.

All, however, reassembled on the next day, and William of Plaisan, taking up, as he expressly stated, the rôle of William of Nogaret (then absent preparing, it would seem, the sacrilege of Anagni),¹ brought forward twenty-nine points which, or a sufficient number of which, he professed to be able to prove, and which would show that Boniface "was a perfect heretic".² Then repeating the allegations of Nogaret, he said that Boniface did not believe in the immortality of the soul. Naturally, therefore, he did not believe in a future life, but maintained that no kind of bodily satisfaction could be a sin. He did not believe in the real presence, but caused more honour to be paid to himself than to the altar, and set up silver images of himself in churches, leading men into idolatry. Moreover, he had "a private demon" (or "spook" as we should say) whom he consulted on everything. He was ever promoting wars, but never peace. He was also guilty of sodomy, murder, and was ever engaged in depreciating the College of Cardinals and the religious Orders. He used the goods of the Church to enrich his relatives, whom he made nobles, and whom he allowed to deprive Roman nobles of their lands and build fortresses thereon. He even forced an evil-living nephew to divorce his wife and become a cardinal; and he even killed his predecessor.

We have given enough and more than enough of the utterances of this foul-mouthed lawyer; but we will add that all through them he put into the mouth of Boniface sayings which were calculated to arouse French feeling against him. He credited him with asserting that he would rather "be a dog or an ass than a Frenchman,"³

¹ See the document of Oct. 17, 1303, already cited. Dupuy, pp. 174-6.

² Dupuy, p. 102. The 29 points "*quæ vera fore, et me probare posse credo, vel quæ sufficient ex ipsis, ad probandum ipsum* (Boniface) *perfectum hæreticum*".

³ Charge 2, p. 102.

and that, if he could not do it in any other way, he would willingly ruin the world and the Church to be able to ruin the King of France and his people.¹ Even before he became supreme Pontiff he used to say that if ever he became Pope, he would rather overthrow Christendom than fail to shake "the proud race of the French",² who were nothing but Patarene heretics.³ He had, so he had declared publicly, confirmed Albert, King of Germany, in the Empire "in order that he might destroy the haughty nation of the French who had declared that they were not subject to him in temporal matters".⁴ The very last charge but one which he levelled at Boniface was to the effect that he had averred "that in short time he would make all the French martyrs or apostates".⁵

When he had finished enumerating his charges against Boniface, he appealed to a General Council, a future Catholic Pope, and the Holy Roman Church against any action Boniface might take against him and his adherents.

What the
assembly
failed to do.

Before proceeding further, we will note that this wretched assembly did not touch on a single one of the real points at issue. The bull "Unam Sanctam" was not as much as mentioned, nor were any of the questions raised by it brought forward for discussion. No attempt was made to show either that the kingdom of France was not a member of that Christian commonwealth of which the Pope was the recognized head, or that, even if it was, it had a right to separate itself from the corporate body of Christendom. Nor was any attempt made to show that, if the Pope had power in temporal matters, he had

¹ Charge 7, p. 103.

² Charge 21, p. 104.

³ Charge 14.

⁴ Charge 22, p. 105.

⁵ Charge 28, p. 106. At the end of his indictment he declared that he spoke of what he had seen or heard from trustworthy witnesses or had *conjectured* from the facts stated: "*ex verisimilibus conjecturis, et probabilibus præsumptionibus, collectis ex prædictis, etc.*," p. 106.

received it, not from God, but from the people, and that the people who gave it could withdraw it, or could define and limit it, should occasion arise. Whether the French were at this period more proud than other peoples or not, there is no doubt that the proceedings of the Louvre assembly of 1303 and the other cognate proceedings of Philip showed a disdainful and regrettable disregard for what we may call the international law of the Middle Ages, and inaugurated a regime of irresponsible governments which culminated in the late awful European war, and which all serious men are desirous of bringing to an end.

If the real points at issue between France and the Holy See were not discussed by this servile gathering, still less were the real grievances which the people and the French Church had against Philip. The assembly of the Louvre was brought together to serve as an instrument to help the advance of the King of France to a position of absolutism, and, with that end in view, to bring about the fall of Pope Boniface, the one man in Christendom capable of stopping that advance.

When Plaisan had finished his indictment of Boniface, Philip declared that, after what Plaisan and before him ^{Philip formally appeals to a} Nogaret had said, he was forced by his zeal for the faith ^{General Council.} and to avoid scandal to assent "save in all things the honour of reverence due to the Holy Roman Church", to the calling of a General Council. He would himself support the summoning of it, and he called upon the bishops present to do so likewise. Then, as Boniface was sure to attempt to use the spiritual sword against him and against his people, he appealed against him to the General Council and to the future legitimate Pope,

¹ But even the *Chronog. Reg. FF.*, p. 95, avers that the proceedings of Philip: "magis fervore odii, quam justitiæ procedere videbantur."

adhering to the form of appeal already made by Nogaret.¹ In conclusion, he demanded the adhesion of the bishops and notaries present.

The
assembled
prelates also
appeal to a
General
Council.

Thereupon, speaking on the same lines as the King, the ecclesiastics, with the striking exception of the abbot of Cîteaux,² protested that, as it was a question of the faith which they were bound to defend, they felt as it were compelled, after what they had heard, to agree to the calling of a General Council, and to appeal to it against any action which Boniface might take against them. They had acted thus, they said, saving the honour due to the Roman Church, and in the firm hope that the innocence of Boniface would be established before the Council.³ If the servile conduct of the prelates at this meeting effected nothing else, it earned for them strong condemnation from independent laymen. They were denounced for preferring Paris, where St. Peter never had been, to Rome, and for denying their father and Rome, the mother of all.⁴

¹ "Non recedendo ab appellatione per dictum G. de Nogareto interposita." Dupuy, p. 108.

² "Showing great disdain of King and prelates, the abbot of Cîteaux alone refused his assent with indignation." *Les Grandes Chroniques*, v, 150.

³ "Convocationem . . . dicti Concilii . . . utilem et omnino necessariam reputantes, ut ipsius d. Bonifacii innocentia clareat, sicut teste conscientia exoptamus." *Ib.* Cf. another declaration of the same prelates in which they proclaim their intention of defending the rights of the King even against "the lord Pope Boniface VIII. who is said to have uttered many threats against them (the King and his family) and the kingdom of France." *Ib.*, p. 112; ep. of June 15, 1303.

⁴
"Si firent de Paris leur Romme
Où Saint Pierre onques ne sist.
Leur mauvez cuer fère lor fist,
Quand ils renièrent lor père
Et Romme qui de tous est mère."

Geoffrey of Paris, ap. *R. F. SS.*, t. xxii, p. 91.

Promising protection against Boniface,¹ Philip, when the assembly had been dismissed, called upon all the prelates, barons, and communes of his realm to show that they supported his action,² and he took care to send round knights with full powers to obtain the desired letters of adhesion.³ "As pertaining to them," he also urged the College of Cardinals to call the General Council,⁴ ordered sermons to be preached proclaiming the *crimes* of Boniface,⁵ and by letters endeavoured to obtain support for his schemes in Spain, Portugal, Navarre, and Italy.⁶ In reviewing these methods of procedure resorted to by Philip, we may, without any danger of exaggeration, say with a French writer, that "in covering his attacks on the papacy under an appearance of law and public opinion, he really directed them by means of violence, calumny, and fraud".⁷

To propagate Nogaret's charges against the Pope, and thereby to arouse French feeling against him, Philip made use even of the pulpit. On the feast of St. John

Propagation
of the
charges
against
Boniface,
1303.

¹ *Ib.*, pp. 113, 116, of the same date (June 15). Cf. similar letters of August, *ib.*, p. 115.

² *Ib.*, p. 109, also of June 15. Cf. ep. of July 1, 124.

³ *Ib.*, ep. of July 1, ap. *ib.*, p. 124. Philip called the knights his "special messengers", giving them full powers to act, and ratifying *all* that they might do in getting the required signatures: "ratum habituri et gratum *quicquid* per eos (the Knights) . . . factum gestum vel procuratum fuerit in hac parte." Bernard Guidonis, *Chron.*, ap. *R. F. S.*, xxi, p. 713, speaks of pressure used by the royal messengers to get the assent of the clergy: "Mittuntur . . . regii nuncii . . . ad perurgendum personas ecclesiasticas . . . ut appellationibus . . . inhærent."

⁴ Ep. of July 1, 1303, ap. *ib.*, p. 126. A Rhineland Chronicle of the beginning of the fourteenth century declares that Philip even thought of creating an antipope: "fere omne regnum suum ad scisma contra papam provocaverat, novum laborans papam creari." See L. Delisle's ed. of this fragment, ap. *Notices et extraits*, t. xxxv, p. 385.

⁵ *Mart. Pol. cont. Ang.*, ap. *M. G. SS.*, xxiv, pp. 255-6.

⁶ Epp. of July, ap. *ib.*, pp. 126-7.

⁷ These are the words of Rocquain, *La papauté*, p. 231.

the Baptist (June 24), as we learn, curiously enough, from a contemporary document in old French preserved in the Register of John de Halton, bishop of Carlisle,¹ Bertold de St. Denis, bishop of Orleans, preached "in the King's garden" before Philip, and a number of clergy, and a great crowd of people. He informed his hearers that, in consequence of certain things that had been said against him, the King and his council had drawn up, for the good of his country and the Church, certain articles which would be read out to them. This was done, first by a clerk in Latin; but, as "his voice was feeble", a certain Master Gilles de Remys, by the King's order, read them out in French. After proclaiming what the Kings of France had done for the faith and for "the holy Church of Rome", he proceeded to enumerate the charges against Boniface with which the reader is now familiar. The articles, of course, gave special prominence to what the Pope *said* against France and the French. When Master Gilles had finished reading the articles, he gave out the King's appeal to a General Council and the rest in Latin as well as in French. Then two Dominicans and two Franciscans held forth on the same subject, and told the people that as the Pope wished to destroy the King and his people, they called upon all to protect them.²

The friars in turn were followed by Johan de Monceny, "borgois" of Paris, who, after declaring that the chapters of the kingdom and the University of Paris had given their adhesion to the steps to be taken against the Pope, called upon the assembly to signify its approval of them. Thereupon "the greater part (*la plus grant parties*)

¹ Vol. i, p. 209 ff., ed. Thompson, York and Canterbury Society, London, 1913.

² E puis que le pape voit destruire le roi e le roialme, nous devons trestous prier les prelas, contes e barons . . . qu'il voillent maintenir l'estat du roi e de son roialme." *L.c.*, p. 211.

of those present " signified their assent, shouting, " Oil, oil, oil " !

On the following day, the same record says that the King sent some of his followers to the convents of the Dominicans and Franciscans to examine the friars individually, and to find out whether they agreed to his proposals or not. To the honour of human nature, they found a considerable number of non-French friars who would not give their adhesion to the lies and illegalities which had been put before them for their assent. They were promptly expelled from the country.¹

By these methods, however, during the months of Philip July, August, and September, Philip secured a very ^{Philip secures support for his schemes.} considerable number of promises of adhesion to his projected plan of campaign against Pope Boniface. Dupuy, indeed, says that he received " more than seven hundred acts of consent and adhesion to his appeal " from bishops, religious communities, the military Orders, Universities, nobles, and cities ; and he says that, with regard to the last named, all declared that they would obey the Church only in things spiritual, and that the King had received his power from God for the defence of the faith. He adds that " several cardinals " also approved the King's action.² But in the Acts of adhesion which he actually gives,³ there is no example of any promise of support from any cardinal. Without doubt, the only cardinalial offers of support which Philip received came from the two Colonna cardinals,⁴ or possibly

¹ " Troverent assez de diverses langes qui ne s'i vouloient assentir. E ceus qui ne s'assentirent, il leur commanderent tantost de par le roi de voider le roialme : e ceus s'en alerent tantost."

² Dupuy, p. 111.

³ Between pp. 117 and 181.

⁴ For, as we have seen, they ultimately fled to France. " Cardinales de Columna, qui se ad regem Aragonum contulerant ad regem Francie se contulerunt." *Annales Colmar.*, an. 1303, *ubi infra*.

from cardinals Napoleon Orsini or Richard of Siena. Moreover, from these same examples, it appears that a large proportion of them came from the south of France which from the days of the licentious troubadours and the spread of the Albigensian heresy had, naturally enough, been hostile to the Church. Besides, not a few of the *Acts* given by Dupuy contain such clauses as rendered them of little avail as evidence of any determination to take any action against Boniface. A number, for instance, of the nobility of Navarre agreed to fall in with Philip's proposals about a General Council and the rest, "ever save in all things the authority, rights, honour of the Holy Roman Church, and the obedience due to it".¹ Others agreed "under conditions and protests".² Some, in fine, but very few, alas! (as always happens when there is question of opposing the brute force of a violent government), refused altogether to have anything to do with Philip's schemes.³

Boniface's
replies to
Philip, Aug.
15, 1303.

Despite the fact that Philip, under the most drastic penalties of confiscation of property and death, renewed his prohibitions against anyone leaving the kingdom without his express permission,⁴ news of what he was doing got to the ears of Boniface. He promptly issued

¹ Epp. ap. Dupuy, pp. 127 and 129.

² Cf. *ib.*, p. 134: "sub modis et conditionibus et protestationibus factis." So a prior of the Order of Cluny and a Templar. Dupuy, p. 111, speaks of eleven cases where members of different Orders "do not speak frankly".

³ Dupuy says (p. 111) that six Cistercian houses refused their consent, as we have seen did the abbot of the whole Order: "abbate Cistercii dumtaxat excepto." *Contin. Will. of Nangis*, i, p. 336. It appears also that the abbots of Cluny and Prémontré followed the example of Cîteaux, for the *Annals of Colmar* (ap. Böhmer, *Fontes*, ii, 42), says that all three were seized by Philip "quia noluerunt ei contra papam in suis constitutionibus obedire".

⁴ Dupuy, pp. 131-3, for docs. of the "Sunday after the feast of St. Mary Magdalen (July 22)".

"a perpetual memorial of the affair—ad perpetuam rei memoriam".¹ In the most judicial manner, as though he were dealing with the case of another, Boniface set forth what he had been told had been said against him "in the garden of King Philip at Paris", and how the King and those present had assented to what had been said against him. The King, too, incurring thereby grave censures, had received Stephen Colonna, the enemy of the Pope and the Roman Church. The thoughtful, said Boniface, would easily see in what sort of spirit the meeting had been conducted, and how the authority of the Church and the Popes would be shaken unless it were met with equal vigour. He had been blasphemously accused of heresy and crime. But whoever heard of a charge of heresy ever being brought against us? Of such a thing not one of my kinsmen, not one in the whole of Campania in which we were born, has ever been charged. When we were loading the King with favours, we were Catholic enough. What has made him change his mind? All know it is because we blamed him for his faults. Is he greater than the Emperor Valentinian who when he had done wrong submitted to the bishop of Milan? Are we, the successor of St. Peter, less than the bishop? He who would be in the barque of Peter, must submit to the guidance of the helmsman. The King's reception of Stephen Colonna is more than enough to show the spirit that animates him. Far be it from us to avoid correcting wrong, even if committed by Kings or Princes. Are we, who alone can do so, are we, at the bidding of men inspired with such evil motives as are clearly those of the King of France, to call a General Council to examine

¹ *Ib.*, p. 166, or *Reg.*, n. 5383. As this document was mutilated by order of Clement V., Digard has edited it ("Nuper ad audientiam") by supplying the erasure from copies of the process against Boniface preserved in Paris and in the Vatican library.

a charge of heresy against ourselves when, under similar circumstances, we could not allow such a thing in the case of a bishop? Must we not so act that in future no King will follow the example of the King of France, and attempt in such a way to avoid correction? Despite his frivolous appeal, we will, unless he repents, proceed against him and his followers as expediency shall dictate.

It will be observed that, even yet, there is no direct personal excommunication of Philip by the Pope.¹ Still is more time given him. The official acts of Boniface present to us a very different figure to that drawn for us by most of those who have written of him.

Measures
taken by the
Pope against
Philip, 1303.

On the same date (Aug. 15), however, Boniface took a number of steps against Philip. He renewed the excommunication against all who in any way interfered with citations to Rome,² reserved to the Holy See provisions to all cathedral churches,³ suspended the powers of all who had the right to give licence to teach or preach,⁴ and suspended also Gerard, archbishop of Nicosia, who had instigated Philip to his rebellious conduct.⁵

The last bull
of Boniface
VIII.,
"Super
Petri Solio—
On Peter's
throne,"
Sept. 8, 1303.

As day followed day, and no word reached the Pope from Philip, he took further action. He drew up a statement which he dated and intended to publish on the Nativity of our Lady (Sept. 8, 1303); but, as we shall see, was prevented from doing so by his capture by Nogaret on the day before. Even yet, marvellous to tell, this supposed haughty and uncontrollable Pontiff refrained from proceeding against Philip in his own name. He still merely threatened to do so.⁶ Acting, as always, with

¹ Ptolemy of Lucca noticed this: "Papa B. regi Franciæ litem movit, et licet *indirecte* ipsum excommunicavit, etc." *Annales*, an. 1303.

² *Reg.*, n. 5384.

³ *Ib.*, n. 5387.

⁴ *Ib.*, n. 5386.

⁵ *Ib.*, n. 5385. These acts may also be read in Dupuy, p. 161 ff.

⁶ If he did not repent "justo in eum judicio animadvertere compellamur". Ap. Dupuy, p. 186, or ap. *Bullar. Rom.*, iv, p. 174, for this bull may be read in both those sources. The above-mentioned words

the advice of the cardinals,¹ he refrained from himself excommunicating Philip by name; but once more contented himself with drawing out this time more at length the sentences he had,* *de facto*, drawn upon himself by his breaches of existing laws.

Seated by God's will, so he began his process, on Peter's high throne, he was the Vicar of the Son of God, to Whom the ends of the earth had been given, and Whose right it was to rule the Gentiles "with a rod of iron, and break them in pieces like a potter's vessel. And now, O ye Kings, understand, receive instruction, you that judge the earth. Serve ye the Lord with fear. . . . Embrace discipline lest at any time the Lord be angry, and you perish from the just way" (Ps. ii, 8 ff.). Hence, in accordance with the Scriptures, the authority of the Fathers, and right reason, we have to judge great and small alike. But the good father tempers justice with mercy, and so, as he has no wish to break, as he might well do, he will be content to exercise the functions of one who simply judges. In that capacity he has to point out that the King has incurred the sentence of excommunication long ago passed against those who interfere with men going to Rome—"contra Romipetas spoliantes". For he has so acted "that no one can come freely to the Apostolic See". He has ill-treated the Pope's messengers one after another, and so he has every reason to fear that his vineyard will be taken away and given to another. He has also compelled men to consent to his frivolous appeal against us, and on that account has imprisoned the abbot of Cîteaux and many others.

occur towards the end of the "processus". He speaks in the same way towards the beginning: "Quinimo utentes denuntiatorum officio, nullas poenas Philippo Francorum regi imponimus; sed ei, propter excessus suos excommunicato notorie, *inflictas* potius *a jure* intimamus."

¹ He speaks of his "processus, quem de consilio fratrum nostrorum facimus". *Ib.*, *sub fin.*

He has shown public favour to Stephen and other Colonnas, enemies of the Church ; regardless of the excommunication published against any who supported them. The Pope, therefore, must decide that the King has certainly incurred excommunication,¹ and that consequently he has lost all powers of conferring benefices which may have been granted him,² and his subjects are *ipso facto* freed from any duty of obedience to him. Accordingly he absolves them from their allegiance to him ; and, as long as he is under excommunication, forbids them to serve him. He also declared null and void any alliances he might have made with any kings or princes.³

Finally, in order that it might become known to the whole world, the Pope declared his intention of having his sentence affixed to the doors of the cathedral of Anagni on the eighth of September. As, however, he was in the hands of Nogaret on that day, it can only have been published after his liberation.

¹ The Pope puts his evil ways down to the Sirens who surround him, but he cannot for that reason clear him of responsibility.

² Anyone who should accept such a benefice from him would be regarded as an intruder, and would never be able to receive a benefice in the future.

³ It will be seen then that such statements (and they are the common ones) as the following about the action of Boniface at this juncture are not quite accurate. The Pope did not strictly "fulminate a sentence of excommunication", he declared that such a sentence had been incurred: "Post legitimam citationem, in regem Franciæ excommunicationis sententiam fulminavit." *Ann. Halesbrun.*, 1303, ap. *M. G. SS.*, xxiv, 46.

CHAPTER X.

THE SACRILEGE OF ANAGNI.

Sources.—In the *Revue des Quests. historiques*, vol. xi (1872), p. 511 ff., there was printed what was regarded as a then unpublished account of the Anagni tragedy: "Une relation inédite de l'attentat d'Anagni." It had been found by the baron Kervyn de Lettenhove in a manuscript in the British Museum (Reg., xiv, c. 1) As a matter of fact, the document had already been printed by H. T. Riley in his ed. of *Rishanger* (1865, R. S.) who had inserted it in his *Annales Regis Edward I.* (p. 483 ff.). It is a letter which had been written to a friend in England by one of the members of the papal court ("nos qui sumus curtesani"¹ he wrote) who was in Anagni at the time of the outrage; and had been dispatched not long after the Pope's death. It is entitled in *Rishanger*: "De horribili insultatione et deprædatione Bonifacii Papæ: On the horrible outrage on and plundering of Pope Boniface," and gives us fuller details than any of the other accounts. We shall cite it as *R.*

It should be supplemented by a short letter of another "curtesanus", or, at least, of one who was in Anagni at the time. It was written a little before the other, was sent to Vienne, and there copied on to a spare leaf in a book concerning liturgy. It is now in the library of the city of Grenoble (n. 130). It has been printed in the *Revue des Q. H.*, vol. xliii (1888), Apr., p. 557 ff. It will be cited as *V.*

In this Anagni affair, as in other matters concerning Pope Boniface, as we have noted before, the Chronicle of Orvieto is well informed. It is in vol. xv, p. 202, of the new ed. of *R. I. SS.* It will be cited as *O.*

Then we may consult the letter of Benedict XI., "Flagitiosum scelus," June 7, 1304, and his *Processus* against the perpetrators of the outrage, both in Dupuy, pp. 232 and 500; and the endless

¹ At this period the word "curtesani" denoted "proctors or advocates" at the papal court. The proper spelling of the word was not at first perceived, and so the writer was thought to be of "Cesena".

"processes" against Boniface in the pontificate of Clement V. (*ib.*, p. 315 ff.), including Nogaret's own account of the attack on Pope Boniface, *ib.*, p. 239 ff., and of its preliminaries, *ib.*, p. 251 ff., 269 ff. See also *ib.*, p. 295 ff. for Philip's version of them.

Works.—All church histories of the period, of course, treat of the seizure of Pope Boniface. Here we shall only mention two special articles on the subject. The first is by Dr. J. I. Döllinger, "Anagni" in *Addresses on hist. subjects*, ed. Margaret Warre, London, 1894, and the second by Prof. P. Fedele, "Per la storia dell' attentato di Anagni" in the *Bullettino dell' Istituto Storico Italiano*, n. 41, 1921. I quote from the *Estratto*, kindly given me by the Professor, now a Minister in the Italian Government. It is of the greatest value, clear, and most accurate, and I have used it freely.

Lo! the flower-de-luce (fleur-de-lys)
Enters Alagna (Anagni): in His Vicar, Christ
Himself a captive, and this mockery
Acted again. Lo! to his holy lip
The vinegar and gall once more applied:
And he 'twixt living robbers doomed to bleed.
Lo! the new Pilate, of whose cruelty
Such violence cannot fill the measure up."

Dante, *Purg.*, xx, 86 ff.

Preparations
for the
seizure of
Boniface.

At the Louvre assembly of March 12, 1302, we have seen ¹ Nogaret suggesting that Boniface should be seized. The suggestion came from a man who, it would seem, had already proposed that the Pope should be captured and brought to France, or, at any rate, who had agreed to seize him himself. On March 7, 1302, he along with Jean Mouchet (the same as Musciatto Guidi dei Franzesi ²) and Masters Thierry d'Hiricon and Jacques de Gesserin, was commissioned by Philip to go "to certain parts on our particular business". They were given full power to negotiate with all and sundry of whatever station or

¹ *Supra*, p. 336.

² Cf. epp. of Boniface to his family (*Reg.*, 1512-13) *re* their building a monastery, and to his banking company, n. 1578.

rank in life, to form confederations with them, and to agree to supply them with help in men or money.¹ As this was the document on the strength of which, after the Anagni outrage, Nogaret appealed for help to Rinaldo or Raynald de Supino, captain of Ferentino, it is clear to what the business of the King referred. Besides Nogaret directly states at the same time that, before the attack on the Pope, he had been in communication with Ferentino and the commune of Anagni "on the King's service for the benefit of the true faith."² As Nogaret was not present, as we have seen, at the second assembly of the Louvre in June, 1303, we may take it that he was already at work on what Gregorovius describes as his master's "dishonourable expedient in order to silence his opponent".³ And what was that expedient? Some historians have said that it was actually to kill the Pope.⁴ However, from the subsequent conduct and words of Nogaret, we may conclude that the object of Philip and his advisers was simply to gain possession of the person of the Pope, and then act as circumstances might dictate.⁵

At any rate, from the Chronicle of Villani,⁶ we see what steps were taken, "with great caution," by Philip, on the advice of Stephen Colonna "and other sage Italians and

The preliminary work of Nogaret, 1302-3.

¹ Ap. Dupuy, p. 175.

² "Pro ejusdem d. Regis servitio in favorem fidei orthodoxæ." *Ib.*

³ *Rome*, v, pt. ii, p. 578.

⁴ Henry of Hervordia, e.g., writing about 1370, states that Philip in conjunction with the Colonnas, plotted the death of the Pope: "mortem et exterminium Bonifacii meditantur." *Chron.*, p. 220, ed. Potthast, Göttingen, 1859. Cf. *Chron. anon. Cadomensis*, "Cogitavit (rex) de ipsius pape interitu." P. 164, ed. Chatel, Caen, 1812. So also Ferreti, *Hist.*, ii, p. 149, declares that Philip persuaded "the most audacious" Sciarra "ut in Bonifacii necem molitur".

⁵ Gregorovius, *l.c.*, p. 579, believes that they intended to bring him before a council. But any council he could have induced to condemn Boniface would have had to be too packed a one to have carried any weight.

⁶ viii, 63.

men of his own realm". Nogaret of Provence, whom Villani describes as a "wise and crafty clerk", and Mouchet were sent into Tuscany "furnished with much ready money and with drafts" on Philip's bankers, the Peruzzi, for as much more as they needed.¹ Making their headquarters at Mouchet's castle, still to be seen at Staggia near Poggibonsi, "they abode there for a long time . . . and caused people to come to them in secret, giving out openly that they were there to treat concerning peace between the Pope and the King of France." In this way, they carried on their "secret negotiations to take Pope Boniface prisoner in Anagni, spending thereupon much money,² corrupting the barons of the country, and the citizens of Anagni".

According to his custom of many years, Boniface had betaken himself to Anagni in the month of May (1303), "not thinking or knowing of this plot; or, if he had heard anything of it, not heeding it through his great courage."³

It need not be said that money was not needed by Nogaret to gain over the Colonnas. He could count on the robber Stephen, and the wild Sciarra. Opportunity of revenge was all they asked for. Probably, too, little or none was required to secure the services of Adenolfo, the violent son of "the most violent" Mattia of Anagni, and his brother Nicholas.⁴ They were ever ready to stir

¹ For the honour of his countrymen, Villani is careful to add that the Peruzzi did not know for what the money was required.

² Ferreti, also, *Hist.*, ii, p. 149, notes the amount spent over the plot. Sciarra "aurum argentumve ad virorum comparationem prodigus erogavit". Hocsemius, too, tells how Nogaret, "a distinguished professor of law, and the chief counsellor of Philip," "poured out" money ("effuso regis thesauro") in corrupting the people of Anagni. *Chron.*, c. 29, p. 115.

³ *Ib.*, trans. Selfe.

⁴ On this "violent" pair, see R. de Magistris in his notes to his edition of the "Inventario anagnino del 1321", ap. *Arch. Rom. di Storia Pat.*, 1884, p. 271 f. In this inventory, Boniface is called "most holy Father of good memory".

up the waters in order that they might the more profitably fish therein. Most fortunately for Nogaret, Ferentino was at war at the moment with Anagni.¹ The captain of the former, Rinaldo di Supino, naturally wanted money to carry on the feud against Anagni, and so, especially as he was said to be "prone to evil",² he and his son Robert were easily secured as most useful allies. Others suborned by Nogaret were Thomas of Morollo, brother of Rinaldo di Supino, Peter and his son, Stephen of Genazzano, Goffredo of Ceccano, the brothers Bussa, and other citizens of Anagni.³

Moreover, if we are to trust Ferreti, there were traitors in the Pope's own *entourage*. According to him,⁴ cardinal Napoleon Orsini was in close touch with his nephew, Sciarra, and had promised secretly to help his designs.⁵

¹ This is proved by de Magistris, *l.c.*, p. 273, n., from documents noted in the Inventory. See also the *sentence* passed on the perpetrators of the outrage on Boniface by the commune of Anagni. It tells how some of those "after that most heinous crime committed against so great a lord" joined the "men of Ferentino and Alatri, then our enemies". Ap. Rubeus, p. 339.

² Ferreti, *Hist.*, ii, p. 149. Besides, he probably had a grudge against Boniface who had deprived him of a fief. Cf. *Miscellanea*, capsula 73, n. 3, Nov. 9, 1298, *Archiv. Vatican.*, cited by Boutaric, 115, n.

³ See their names in the *sentence* just cited; in the bull of Benedict XI., "Flagitiosum scelus" of June 7, 1304, ap. Dupuy, p. 232; in those of Clement V. of Apr. 20, 1312, ap. *Reg.*, nn. 8248-9, in a letter of Rinaldo di Supino, ap. Dupuy, p. 608 ff., etc.

⁴ In this instance there is abundant reason for believing Ferreti, for we find Pope John XXII. later accusing N. O. of being a Ghibelline: "Vos estis totus Gebellinus." It is true that the Pope was only joking (*per modum truphandi in verbis*), but we know that there is many a true word said in jest. See a letter of an envoy of James II. of Aragon, ap. Finke, *Mon. Ar.*, n. 393, i, p. 615. Besides in the course of the "process" against Boniface, N. O. acknowledged that he had urged Philip to proceed against Boniface. See the *Process*, ap. Mohler, *Die Col.*, p. 255, n. 5, or ap. Höfler, *Rückblick auf B. VIII.*, p. 51.

⁵ The Chron. of Orvieto, *l.c.*, p. 202, implies there were other traitorous cardinals, "quibusdam cardinalibus concordantibus," but

He also undertook to make known to his nephew the best day for making the attack.¹ More important still, Giffrid, one of the brothers Bussa, and commander of the papal guard, had also been won over by the conspirators.²

The seizure
of Boniface.

Acting in conjunction with cardinal Orsini, the traitor Bussa caused the city gates to be opened at dawn on Saturday, Sept. 7. With wild cries of "Long live the King of France and the Colonna!" some six hundred horsemen and over a thousand men-at-arms, headed by Nogaret³ and Sciarra Colonna, bearing the standard of the King of France, poured into the narrow streets of the little hill-city.⁴ The uproar aroused the citizens, and the report ran round like wildfire that the city was in the hands of Sciarra Colonna, who had come with a great force to seize and kill the Pope.⁵ Soon the clang of the great city bell was added to the shouts of the soldiery, and the chief citizens ("i.e., *comitas villæ*"), hastily assembling, quickly elected Adenolfo as their captain, and swore to obey him in all things⁶—totally ignorant, we may suppose, that they had put all power into the hands of a bitter foe of the Pope.

perhaps only the Colonna cardinals, Napoleon Orsini and Richard Petronus of Siena, also mentioned by name by the Chron. of Orvieto, are meant.

¹ *L.c.*, "Hic nepoti annuens, propositum regium laudat seque ad id ope sua latenter exponit."

² *Ib.* Ferreti calls him "Sigonfredus de Busso, pape armiger strenus", p. 151.

³ "Whose father," adds the Chronicle of Orvieto, "is said to have been a heretic." *L.c.*, p. 202.

⁴ *V.*, p. 559; Villani, *l.c.*

⁵ *R.*, p. 483. "Compertum est quod Schaira (sic) . . . venerat ad villam cum magna potentia . . . ut caperet Papam et ipsum *morti* traderet."

⁶ *Ib.* "Homo potentissimus inter omnes de Campania, et, praeter hoc, capitalis inimicus Papae."

Meanwhile, joined, as usual on such occasions, by the scum of the population which everywhere is always ready to take advantage of every chance of loot, and unhindered, if not helped, by the burghers under the command of the traitor Adenolfo, the soldiers of the conspirators dashed on towards the palaces of the Pope and the cardinals. Raising cries of "Death to the Pope and the marquis",¹ one body under Nogaret and Sciarra made for the palaces of the Pope and the marquis Peter, while the other, under Rinaldo di Supino, rushed to sack those of three cardinals specially devoted to Boniface, to wit, his nephew Francesco Gaetani, Gentile of Montefiore, and Theodoric of Orvieto. At the first rumour of the assault, hurried preparations for resistance were made. Barricades were hastily thrown across some of the streets, and the towers were manned. But the surprise was too complete, and although some of the assailants were killed and wounded, the palaces of the cardinals were soon seized.² Cardinal Francesco, whom Nogaret slightly sketches as a "fat robust young man",³ and the other two cardinals whose palaces were first attacked, escaped in various disguises. Their houses were sacked at once, as were those of cardinal Peter of Spain, and of the bishop of Palma. The bank of the Spini shared the same fate.⁴ Nogaret's troops were not, however, so rapidly successful, but joined by Rinaldi and the troop which had plundered the residences of the cardinals, they soon reduced the papal household to such extremities that the Pope had to beg for a truce. A few hours' truce, from the first to the ninth hour, was accordingly arranged.⁵

¹ The Pope's nephew Peter.

² See Nogaret's story, ap. Dupuy, pp. 247, 443, *V.*, p. 559, *R.*, p. 484.

³ Ap. D., p. 311, n. 30. Francesco escaped "cum veste cujusdam sui garciferi." *V.*, l.c. G. Gaetani, *Domus G.*, i, p. 172, gives a useful little plan of the Gaetani quarter of Anagni.

⁴ *V.* and *R.*, *ll.cc.*

⁵ *R.*

A truce.

During this brief period of suspension of hostilities, Boniface sent secretly to the people of Anagni, begging them to come to his help, promising to make them all rich should they do so. They, however, replied that they had put all power into the hands of Adenolfo, and that they did not wish to act, and indeed could not do so without his orders.¹ Whilst these negotiations were going on with the people, Boniface requested terms from his enemies. Thereupon the savage Sciarra replied that he could only save his life on three conditions. He must completely restore the Colonna cardinals and all their friends and relatives to their previous state in matters spiritual and temporal; he must then resign the Papacy; and, lastly, he must surrender himself to Sciarra.² These conditions were, of course, rejected, and the attack began again.

The assault reopened.

Finding the cathedral in their way, the assailants burnt down its doors, rushed in, and, killing those who offered any kind of opposition to them,³ plundered it and all who had taken refuge therein.⁴ Freer now to attack the palaces of the Pope and his nephew, they quickly forced the marquis Peter to surrender,⁵ and then more fiercely attacked the windows and doors of the papal palace. At this juncture, some of the Pope's guard went over to the

¹ *Ib.*

² *Ib.*

³ Among the slain was the archbishop of Gran. See the Angevin Register, 1304 A., n. 133, f. 120, ap. M. Riccio, *Studii fatti sopra 84 Reg. Angioni*, p. 102, Naples, 1876. "Petro di Luparia, militi, vassallo nostro citato ad comparandum ponituro justitie super eo quod interfuit et operam dedit captioni b.m.d. Bonifacii P. VIII. et direptioni Tesauri S. R. Ecclesiæ, ac mandavit occidi . . . Mag. Gregorium Strigoniensem electum, sed non comparente fuit banno suppositus, etc." Cf. the foll. entries.

⁴ "Derobarunt omnes clericos et laicos . . . ut non dimiserunt valorem quadrantis quem apprehendere potuerunt." *R.*, p. 485.

⁵ *Ib.*

enemy,¹ and admitted them within the palace gates. With wild shouts, they made for the Pope's apartment, headed by Sciarra. Nearly all fled before them, to hide themselves, so that when the assailants broke into Boniface's room, the only cardinal present was Peter of Spain, bishop of the Sabina.² Unabashed by the sight of the aged Pope seated on his throne, clad in the "great mantle", with the tiara on his head, and the cross of Christ in his hand,³ Sciarra dashed forward, and, in his ungovernable fury, dared to strike the Pontiff on the face,⁴ whilst along with those around him, he uttered the direst threats, and poured forth the most abusive epithets against him.⁵ Insolently called upon to resign the Papacy,

¹ *O.*, "prodentibus hastiariis, de quibus papa confidebat," p. 203.

² *V.*, p. 559; *R.*, p. 486; Thos. of Villanova, ap. Finke, *Aus den Tagen*, p. clxxxii.

³ "Papa paravit se pontificaliter timens occidi." *Annal. Urbevet.*, p. 174; Villani, viii, 63; Ptolemy of Lucca, *H.E.*, l. xxiv, c. 36, p. 1203; Ferreti, i, p. 152, and, most important, Boniface's nephew, card. F. Gaetani, tells that when he was attacked: "erat indutus papalibus, et crucem . . . tenebat . . . et osculabatur." Ap. Dupuy, p. 402. The well-informed John of Victring also speaks of his having the cross. *Chron.*, l. iii, pp. 336, 370, ed. F. Schneider.

⁴ From the authoritative words of Benedict XI. who, as cardinal Nic. Boccasini, was in Anagni at the time of the outrage, it is certain that some "sons of iniquity" laid violent hands on the Pope. "In predecessorem (Boniface) temerariis imo sceleratis . . . injectis manibus effrenis." Ep. of Nov. 6, 1303, ap. *Reg. Bened.*, n. 1099. Cf. ep. of June 7, 1304, *Flagitiosum scelus*. "Manus in eum injecerunt impias, protervas erexerunt cervices ac blasphemiarum voces funestas ignominiose jactarunt." In the trial of Boniface under Clement V., it was said by his friends: "ejus personam notorie aggressus fuit." Ap. Dupuy, p. 400.

⁵ We know from the Chronicle of St. Denis that "one of the Colonnas" struck the Pope, and as we also know that Sciarra wished to kill him, we presume that it was Sciarra who struck him. "Et eust été d'un des chevaliers de la Colompne deux fois parmi le corps féru d'un glaive, ne'un autre chevalier de France ne l'eust contresté; mais toutes fois de ce chevalier de la Colompne en retraiant fu féru au visage." *Philippe le Bel*, c. 52, p. 154.

Boniface, kissing the crucifix which he was holding, replied that he would die sooner, and with the words : " Ec le col, ec le cape," he offered his neck and head to the sword. Sciarra wished to take him at his word, and wanted to kill him where he sat.¹ Fortunately at this moment, Nogaret, who had been busy elsewhere, arrived on the scene, and, as he himself declared over and over again, prevented the cowardly and sacrilegious deed.² Whatever was Nogaret's influence in this matter, Boniface was not killed ; but these satellites of a Christian King tore the sacred ornaments from his person, and took everything of value from his room. Then appointing Rinaldo di Supino and a company of soldiers to guard him, the rest of these professed guardians of the purity of the Catholic faith rushed off to plunder his palace and treasury. While they were thus engaged as the lowest of thieves, Boniface did but exclaim : " The Lord gave, and the Lord hath taken away " (Job i, 21).³

Rogues
quarrel.

We may well believe that, under the hand of Rinaldo di Supino, the poor Pope had a bad time⁴ ; but his enemies soon found that with his capture their own

¹ *R.*, 486.

² Fedele, p. 11, has established this fact, p. 11. Cf. Dupuy, pp. 247-8, nn. 49-53.

³ " Ipse exercitus in primo suo ingressu derobavit Papam, cameram suam, et thesauriam suam de vasis et vestimentis, ornamentis, auro et argento." *R.*, pp. 486-7. Cf. *O.*, p. 203, Dupuy, p. 472. Nogaret, afterwards, at times declared that he had tried to prevent the plundering of the papal palace (e.g., ap. Dupuy, p. 387) ; but, ultimately, he tried to brazen out his robberies by saying that he had acted justly : " Concludit se . . . ea quæ fecit apud Anagniam erga personam dicti Bonifacii et thesaurum ipsius . . . rite et legitime fecisse zelo Dei et fidei ac justitiam exequendo ! " Ap. Dupuy, p. 447.

⁴ *R.*, p. 486. " Et, ut creditur, Papa habuit malam noctem." If it be a fact that Boniface annulled the marriage between his nephew Francis (afterwards cardinal) and Mary, the sister of Rinaldo, the latter's enmity to the Pope is further explained. Dupuy, p. 361, charge 87 against Boniface.

troubles were beginning. Whatever honour there may proverbially be among thieves, rogues soon fall out. Nogaret found that he was not easily going to get his august prisoner out of Anagni to France. Some of the Colonna party, for reasons of their own, would not have the Pope removed from the city.¹ Sunday passed in violent discussion. Sciarra wanted the Pope's death, Nogaret that he should be carried off to France.² Meanwhile the respectable citizens of the place were gradually recovering from the surprise of Saturday morning, and from the perplexity into which they had been thrown by the traitorous action of their hastily elected chief, Adenolfo.³ Groups of them during the whole of Sunday discussed the situation, and all of them met together in secret early on Monday morning. Even those who believed that "Boniface had in his life done a great deal of wrong", declared that, if he were killed in their city the whole world would hold them guilty; their city would be for ever put under an interdict, Mass would never again be said within their walls, and all Christendom would rise against them. They decided they would release the Pope, and, if need be, put his guards to the edge of the sword.⁴

Once again in the morning did the walls of Anagni resound with the clang of steel and the wild cries of angry men. This time the shouts were different! Nogaret, Sciarra, Rinaldo, and their men-at-arms were startled by

Boniface is
released,
Sept. 9.

¹ *V.*, p. 560. "Quidam nobiles . . . de Aranea (Anagni), parentes Columpnarum, nolebant consentire quod d. Papa fuisset ejectus de civitate."

² *R.*, p. 487.

³ This feeling of the people of Anagni that they had been deceived is noted by Hocsemius, *Chron.*, c. 29, p. 116: "Interim populus *deceptum* se penitens quamvis tarde, clamare moriantur Columpnenses et Francigene inceperunt."

⁴ *R.*, pp. 487-8. They swore "quod si custodes Papæ, primo deputati per Capitaneum (Adenolfo) et Schairam, eis resisterent, nullum ex ipsis vitam dimitterent".

the loud roar: "Long live the Pope, death to the foreigner."¹ When the burghers reached the palace, a fierce combat ensued. It was, however, but of short duration. The enemies of Boniface were soon in full flight, leaving many lying dead where they had fought,² or prisoners in the hands of the citizens. Sciarra fled cursing the city and uttering dire threats against its people,³ Nogaret staggered out of its gate wounded and unrecognized, the standard of the French King was torn and with derision dragged in the mud, and Rinaldo and his son were seized.⁴

Meanwhile, releasing the Pope's nephews who were imprisoned in the house of Adenolfo, the citizens who had stormed the palace made their way to the room in which Boniface was confined, and, assuring him that they had come to save him, told him they would take care of him till the tumult was over.⁵

Thereupon, he suffered himself to be carried to the great square of the city and shown to the people. With tears he thanked God and them for having saved his life, and told them that his enemies had plundered him of everything so that he had not even wherewith to eat or drink. If any good woman would give him a little bread and a drop of wine or water, she should have God's blessing and his. With loud shouts of "Long live our Holy Father", the people escorted him back to the palace, and filled his rooms

¹ *V.*, *l.c.*, "Vivat Papa, et moriantur forestanei."

² *R.*, p. 488, "multis interfectis." *V.*, p. 560, "Plures mortui fuerunt."

³ *R.*, pp. 488-9. "Graviter comminatus est in eis."

⁴ *O.*, p. 203. "Guillelmum (Nogaret) incognitum vulneratum abire permittunt . . . vexilla regis Franciæ lacerata per terram turpiter trahunt, etc."

⁵ *R.*, p. 488. "Pater sancte, nos venimus huc ut vitam vestram salvemus, et ideo volumus habere custodiam personæ vestræ, quousque sedetur ista tempestas."

with food for him and his suite.¹ Moreover, they mounted guard over him till the following Friday, when order was completely restored, and took such measures that a great, but not the greater, part of the treasure of the Church was restored.²

On the same day (Mon., Sept. 9) a little later, Boniface Mercy shown
by Boniface. called the people before him, and taking a seat at the top of the great staircase of the palace, he declared that he forgave all who had outraged him, or who had plundered his goods, provided that they were really his own private property and not the property of the Church or of others. Rinaldo and his son were allowed to depart in safety, and not a single person was punished.³ Some, however, including cardinals Richard of Siena and Napoleon Orsini, not daring to hope for pardon, had fled from the city on the first news of the Pope's liberation.⁴ The Pope, however, says the chronicler, of Orvieto "now become meek and mild, offered security to all," and expressed his desire to be reconciled to all his enemies, even to the Colonnas.⁵

Meanwhile, from the moment that the news spread General
disorder. about that the Pope had been seized, disorders broke out in Rome and the Campagna. All who had felt the strong arm of Boniface turned against him, and those nobles who had sold their lands to him for his nephew, the marquis, took advantage of the disturbances to reoccupy the domains they had sold. It seemed as if Rome and

¹ *Ib.*, p. 489. "In momento tota camera sua fuit repleta pane, et vino, et aqua."

² *O.*, p. 203. "Porro de thesauro Ecclesiæ . . . multum recuperatur, licet major pars dicta fuerit deperiisse." *Cf. R.*, p. 490.

³ *O.*, p. 203. "A nullo hostium vindictam sumpsit." *Cf. R.*, p. 490.

⁴ *O.*, *l.c.*, "Ricardus de Senis . . . sibi male conscius festinus fugit. Napoleo de Roma aliquamdiu latuit, quia papæ et suis se multum opposuit."

⁵ *R.*, *l.c.*

the whole district were in the hands of thieves and robbers.¹

Boniface
returns to
Rome,
1303.

Though expelled from Anagni, Nogaret and Sciarra Colonna were not at the end of their resources. Nogaret dashed off to Ferentino to urge its people to renewed efforts against the men of Anagni,² and Sciarra exerted all the influence of his powerful family to stir up enmity to Boniface in all directions.

Though terribly shaken by the outrages that had been inflicted upon him, the aged Pontiff was not entirely crushed. Accordingly the better to cope with the rapidly rising disorders, he listened to the invitation of envoys from the Romans who had no little difficulty in persuading the people of Anagni to allow him to leave their city,³ and set out with them for Rome (Sept. 20). Fortunately he was accompanied by a very large number of armed men,⁴ for the chronicler of Parma avers that he was even attacked by the Colonna party on his return journey to Rome, and that many on both sides were killed.⁵ His enemies, however, were at length driven off, and, after a slow journey, Boniface entered Rome on September 25. He

¹ "Roma et tota terra est corrupta de predonibus et malefactoribus et malis hominibus et nullum dominium est in terra." *V.*, p. 560. *Cf. R.*, p. 491, and the letter of Benedict XI. of Nov. 6, 1303, ap. *Reg.*, p. 657.

² He told them how the people of Anagni "proditionem fecerint eidem (Nogaret) . . . volendo ipsum capere . . . et crudelem mortem inferre, ac trascinare fecissent per Anagniam vexillum d. Regis." See his statement ap. Dupuy, p. 175.

³ *O.*, p. 203. "Romani ambasciatores Anagniam festinanter dirigunt, papam sibi restitui instanter petunt, et, obtenta difficulter a populo Anagnino gratia, ipsum . . . reducunt ad Urbem." *Cf. John of Victring, Chron.*, pp. 336 and 371. He says that the Romans were headed by "the most powerful of the Romans", i.e., by cardinal Matteo Orsini. See also a chronicler, ap. *RR. FF. SS.*, xxi, p. 149.

⁴ *R.*, p. 490, "cum maxima multitudine armatorum." *Cf. Stefan-eschi, De canoniz.*, i, 11.

⁵ *Ap. R. I. SS.*, ix, p. 86, new ed.

remained a day or two at the Lateran, and then took up his abode in St. Peter's, Sept. 28.¹ "There," adds the writer of the letter to England we have so often quoted, "he resides at this moment greatly dejected (*valde tristis*), because it would seem that he realizes that he has so many enemies in Tuscany and the Campagna that only in Rome can he be safe from the Colonnas."²

In Rome, the Orsini and the great mass of the people, who received him with great acclaim,³ were with him. But even there, he had his difficulties; and the senators, Tebaldodi Matteo (of the Orsini), and Alessio di Giacomo di Bonaventura, either in terror, or because they were suspected by the people, resigned their office into their hands.⁴

The writer of the letter to England, evidently not a very courageous person, was in a great state of perturbation. He expected to be robbed every day. Yet he dared not leave Rome, because he believed that all round the city the robbers were so numerous and fierce that one would not be safe with even sixty well-armed men.⁵ The Vienne correspondent, however, took a more hopeful view. We are on the way to peace and order, he wrote, because the Pope has returned to Rome.⁶

¹ *R.*, pp. 490-1.

² *Ib.*, p. 491. That only in the Eternal City, which he calls "the most solid rock of the faith of Christ", could Boniface find rest and security is a point made much of by Petrarch when he wrote to Urban V. to beg him to return to his See. *Epp. Senil.*, vii, 1. In G. Fracassetti's Italian version, i, p. 404.

³ "Nunquam sic gloriis armis,
Sic festus susceptus ea, Cleroque decorus
Insignisve fuit."

Stefaneschi, *De Canoniz.*, i, c. 11, p. 659. Cf. p. 617, "Magnifice susceptus."

⁴ We have given the names of the senators from Vitale, *I Senatori*, i, p. 207. Cf., however, Bouïard, *Le régime de Rome*, p. 250.

⁵ *R.*, p. 491.

⁶ *V.*, p. 560.

A more important source of comfort to the lovers of law and order was the news that the two great vassals of the Holy See, Charles II. of Naples and Frederick III. of Sicily, acting in full harmony with each other, were making active preparations to come to Rome to support the Pope. From September 21 onwards, we see Charles issuing various orders to facilitate Frederick's journey to Rome, to prepare for his own accommodation there, and to arrange for the government of his kingdom during his absence.¹

He did not reach Rome, it would seem, before the death of Boniface (Oct. 11), but, as we shall see, he was in time for the coronation of his successor, Benedict XI. (Oct. 27, 1303).²

Whether Boniface derived any comfort from the news of the coming of Charles, we do not know. He was probably too ill to care. A man of his age and infirmities could not stand the terrible strain to which he had been submitted at Anagni. Naturally enough his nerves gave way. He thought that everyone who came to see him had come to seize him, and so could not rest till he had seen who his visitor was.³ Feeling his end drawing nigh,⁴

¹ See the documents from the Archives of Naples in Fedele, nn. 2-8.

² According to Ptolemy of Lucca, *H.E.*, lib. xxiv, p. 1224, he entered Rome on the day of the death of Boniface.

³ Ptolemy of Lucca, *H.E.*, xxiv, 36. "Ab omni superveniente putabat capi, et ideo in eorum oculos et facies *videre* cupiebat." To this reading of the contemporary Ptolemy, Gregorovius (whose account of the last days of Boniface rests on his own imagination and on the preposterous stories of Ferreti, etc.), of course prefers the false reading of Jordanus, the copyist of Ptolemy, and would make out that Boniface wanted to *tear* the faces of his visitors: "et ideo in eorum oculos et facies *manus injicere* cupiebat." Ap. Muratori, *Antiq. Ital.*, p. 1020.

⁴ We have taken no notice of an indelicate story connected with the last days of Boniface, which is told by Infessura in the first chapter of his *Diario*. Infessura was not born till more than thirty years after the death of Boniface, and not only does he not give any kind of authority for the story, but it is clear that he did not know how to select good

Death of
Boniface,
Oct. 11,
1303.

Boniface made the usual profession of faith,¹ confessed his sins before eight cardinals, most calmly expired; and, as cardinal Stefaneschi believed, encountered not an angry Judge, but a merciful Father.²

As we learn from his successor, Benedict XI., the body of Boniface, "after his devoted labours," was with becoming solemnity duly buried, while his soul, as the same Pope trusted, "was called to its reward." ■ It was on the day after his death, that the body was solemnly placed in the tomb which Boniface had himself erected in St. Peter's,⁴ and which we have already described.

sources, or did not care to, as the whole chapter is a mass of mistakes. The curious must refer to Infessura, or to G. Gaetani, who quotes the story, and seems to like to decorate his pages with stories of that kind. Nor have we taken any notice of the letter given by Dupuy, *Preuves*, p. 5, about the last days of Boniface, as its confused chronology alone is enough to show its uselessness.

¹ The *Grandes Chroniques* pretends that he died without making the profession. But its editor properly notes that the statement is not true, and adds that "the Gallican Church which had condemned him as a heretic had an interest in denying that he had made the profession".

² "Fassusque, fidem veramque professus
Romanæ Ecclesiæ, Christo. tunc redditur almus
Spiritus."

De canoniz., i, c. 11. "Ubi (Rome) ex tristitia et senectute, infirmitate gravatus . . . mortuus est." *O.*, p. 203. Cf. the assertion of the defenders of Boniface before Clement V., who declare that there was extant a letter of cardinal Gentile on his good death. Ap. Dupuy, p. 402. Cf. *ib.*, p. 493: "D. Bonifacius in extremis constitutus explicite professus fuit fidem Catholicam in præsentia multorum Cardinalium, et aliarum honorabilium personarum, ac asseruit et professus fuit firmiter se tenuisse Catholicam fidem quam tenet . . . Rom. Ecclesia, et in eadem fide se vixisse et mori velle professus est." Cf. *ib.*, pp. 497 and 395. The calm end of Boniface was proved to evidence when his incorrupt body was examined. Cf. Grimaldi on the opening of the tomb of Boniface in 1605, ap. *Cod. Barb. Lat.*, n. 2733, fol. 5v-7. It is printed by Dionysio, *Crypt. Vat.*, i, 128 ff.

³ *Reg. B. XI.*, n. 1, Oct. 31, 1303. Cf. Ferreti, *Hist.*, i, 164. A version of Ptolemy of Lucca (ap. *R. I. SS.*, xi, p. 1223, says that a violent thunderstorm caused him to be buried "minori reverentia . . . quam Pontificalis status requiret".

⁴ Bern. Guid., p. 672.

The sacrilege
causes a
general
feeling of
horror.

When the story of the outrage at Anagni was noised abroad, it everywhere roused strong feelings of indignation. Even Dante, the Ghibelline, the White, forgot his bitter hatred of Benedetto Gaetani, the Guelf, the Black, and thought only of Christ outraged in His Vicar. Our historians, after telling "of the atrocious and irreverent" seizing of the Pope and of the consequent outraging of the papal dignity and the whole Church, add that "it is a thing unheard of in the history of the world since the peace of the Church had been spread over the whole earth, that false Christians, men who call themselves Christians, and are not, should have committed so monstrous a crime against the supreme pontiff."¹ Peter Langtoft declared:—

"Grete pite it was that the hede of Cristendame
Suld, for any trespas, take so foule a scham."²

Villani tells us that when the dread news reached Sion, in Switzerland, its bishop, "a man of pure and holy life," was struck with pained astonishment, and for awhile remained in silent thought. Then, "coming to himself, he cried aloud in the presence of many good folk: 'The King of France will rejoice greatly on hearing these tidings³; but I have it by Divine inspiration, that for this sin he is judged by God, and that great and strange perils and adversities, with shame to him and his lineage,

¹ Cf. *Flores Hist.*, iii, 116. Cf. from the Eton MS., *ib.*, iii, 313 f. Cf. Stefaneschi:—

"Heu! gravis alluvies, funesta et morbida, nostris
Nec seclis audita lues prorumpit, et audens
Ingruit."

De canoniz., ap. *R. I. SS.*, iii, p. 659.

² R. Mannyng's version, ii, p. 323, ed. Hearne.

³ Naturally all his bitter enemies did likewise, and in the inventory of the *treasury* of the Church made in 1311, there is an entry of a large book containing the processes against those "who rejoiced when they heard that the lord Boniface was dead". Ap. *Reg. Clem. V.*, vol. viii, p. 470.

will overtake him very swiftly, and he and his sons will be cast out from the inheritance of the realm.' " Now we have to note that this prophecy or forecast was not invented after the miserable end of Philip's line; for Villani goes on to assure us that he heard of this saying of the bishop " a little while after, when we passed by Sion, from persons worthy of belief who were present to hear ".¹ Later, the historian tells how Philip died of an accident when hunting wild boar, how his three sons all succeeded each other as Kings of France in a brief space, and how all their wives were unfaithful to them²; and he might have added that, on the death of the last of the three sons (Charles IV., † 1328), the crown passed out of his family to the House of Valois, to the son of that Charles of Valois who stood by Boniface. At these rapid deaths, so a contemporary French historian wrote: " All greatly marvelled thereat, but that, though we do not, God knows the cause of it." ■ It is true we know not the cause; but, Villani suggests that it was " perchance because of the sin committed by their father in taking Pope Boniface, as the bishop of Sion prophesied." ⁴ The same historian, who believes that Boniface did many things displeasing to God, still believes that He punished Philip who outraged him, though " not so much for the injury against

¹ *Chron.*, viii, 64, trans. Selfe.

² *Ib.*, ix, 66.

³ *Contin. Chron. de Jean de S. Victor*, ap. *RR. FF. SS.*, xxi, p. 688.

⁴ *L.c.* William of Egmund also imputes the speedy deaths of Philip's sons " to the divine vengeance " for the crime of Anagni. *Chron.*, p. 46., ed. Hordyk. An English writer has called attention to further disgrace that fell on the family of the Handsome Philip. His daughter, known to us as " the she-wolf of France ", dyed her hands in the blood of her husband (Edward II.), and left those fatal claims to her son, Edward III., that brought such terrible sufferings on France, and did not end till after an English conqueror had been crowned in Paris, and had quartered on his shield those fleurs-de-lys which were to have overshadowed the keys of Peter. See A. Drane, *Christian Schools and Scholars*, ii, pp. 208-9.

the person of Pope Boniface, as for the sin committed against the Divine Majesty, whose countenance he represented on earth".¹

Speaking generally, it may be said that, with the exception of French writers who hardly show a trace of realizing that, as Boniface was at least "great of heart",² he was foully treated, all serious contemporary historians condemn Philip and his satellites for their work at Anagni.³ Some even practically condemn Benedict XI. for his action in pardoning Philip; for, as they point out, by his freeing him from excommunication without exacting satisfaction, his great crime remained unpunished.⁴

he outrage
condemned
even in
France.

But if French contemporary historians have left on record but little sign of French indignation at the sacrilege of Anagni, there was nevertheless a strong general feeling in France against the perpetrators of the deed. This is clear from a document brought to light by Boutaric. It shows that what that writer calls the "audacious

¹ viii, 64. The *Chron. anon. Cadomensis*, ap. *RR. FF. SS.*, xxii, p. 25, states: "Inde (the attack on Boniface) secuta sunt regi Philippo quædam inconvenientia quæ propter peccatum suum... multi asserunt sibi accidisse." Cf. another witness, *ib.*, p. 374, also Rishanger, p. 222, *R. S.*, for the fate of those who laid hands "on the Vicar of Christ"; and John of Victring, *Chron.*, l. iv, vol. ii, p. 63.

² The *Annals of Rouen* (*Ann. Rotomag.*, ap. *M. G. SS.*, xxvi, p. 504), acknowledges his greatness of heart when it says he died: "non tam ex infirmitate pre cordis angustia, dum esset corde magnanimus."

³ Geffroi de Paris, *Chron. rimée*, p. 110, col. 1, has the grace at least to put down the doings of Boniface to his love of the glory of the Church, and to say:—

"Et ose dire qu'en franschise
Fu tenue à son temps l'Yglise.
Et si croi, a vérité dire,
Que l'en li fist tout le martyre
Por l'Yglise qu'il avoit chièr." Ap. *ib.*

⁴ Philip was absolved "sine omni satisfactione, et sic tantum ipsius piaculum remansit inultum." *Ann. Austriæ, contin. Sancruc.*, ap. *M. G. SS.*, ix, p. 733.

violation of the law of nations " provoked a universal expression of disapproval throughout the whole country. Philip was alarmed to find that it caused burning indignation in his very court. All this we learn from a letter sent him by one of his counsellors, perhaps William of Nogaret, which, while telling of this grave situation, suggests that the means of meeting it and of allaying the dangers arising from it are easy. The said counsellor would seem to be Nogaret, because the writer of the letter says that many think that the King and he have uneasy consciences in the matter.¹ Now, who but Nogaret would link himself directly with Philip as the promoter of the attack on Boniface? The means of soothing the public wrath are not directly stated, but the bringing about a schism would appear to be hinted at, as an easy method of achieving that end.

In the midst of the general outburst of indignation at the treatment of Pope Boniface, some did not confine themselves to words. Despite his natural French leanings, Charles II., King of Naples, issued a proclamation against those rebels against the Church and against those enemies of God who " with detestable malignity and execrable audacity ", and " to the dreadful scandal and horror of all men " recently seized the person of the lord Pope Boniface VIII. of happy memory.² The Justiciaries of the Terra di Lavoro and of the Abruzzi were forbidden to receive into their provinces any of those who had been concerned in the horrible outrage against our lord, the Supreme Pontiff; nay, they were to seize them; and, if they found any property that had been stolen from the

Action
against the
enemies of
Boniface,
1303-4.

¹ E. Boutaric, " Documents inedits relatifs à Philippe le Bel," ap. *Notices et extraits*, vol. xx, pp. 149-50. " Quocirca multi . . . existimant ipsum (Philip) meque non omnino quietam . . . habere conscienciam erga Deum."

² Decree of June 23, 1304, ap. C. M. Riccio, *Studi sopra 84 Registri Angioini*, p. 103.

Pope or his nephews, they were to take possession of it and keep it safe.¹ Charles also took steps against Rinaldo di Supino for taking part in the seizure of Boniface and in the plundering of the sacred treasury²; and he confiscated the fiefs of his vassal, Peter de Luparia, for the part he had taken in the outrage.³

Attack on
the Gaetani
lands.

Finally, he granted armed assistance to Peter Gaetani, count of Caserta, and his counsellor, and to Loffrid, count of Fondi, against the barons who had wronged them at the time of the capture of their uncle, the Pope.⁴ This grant has reference to an incident already mentioned. When the bonds of law and order were relaxed after Boniface had fallen into the hands of his enemies, many of those who had sold, willingly or on compulsion, their lands to the Pope or his nephews, endeavoured to recover them by force.⁵ But the Gaetani were not to be dispossessed. Having, as we have said, obtained military help from King Charles II.,⁶ they everywhere throughout Campania overcame their enemies; and during several years' fighting, slew a great many of the men of Ferentino, Sessa, and other hostile centres. It is true that the exiles of Anagni contrived to surprise and kill the marquis Peter, but his sons Benedict and Loffrid soon avenged his death, and overcame their enemies.⁷

¹ *Ib.*

² *Ib.*

³ *Ib.*, pp. 102-3.

⁴ *Ib.*, p. 102. These documents, of which Riccio only gives the summary, are, with other similar ones, given at length by Fedele, p. 30 ff.

⁵ Cf. ep. of Bened. XI. "Nuper Anagnie," of Nov. 6, 1303, *Reg.*, n. 1099, and the assertion of cardinal Francesco Gaetani: "Moverunt Gaitanis eisdem guerras undique illicitas, etc." Ap. Mohler, *Die Kard.*, p. 233.

⁶ See also *O.*, p. 203.

⁷ All this from *O.*, pp. 203-4. Cf. G. Gaetani, *Dom. G.*, i, p. 181 ff.

CHAPTER XI.

SHORT NOTICES REGARDING THE CRUSADES AND THE
EAST, THE RELIGIOUS ORDERS, THE JEWS, DENMARK,
ETC. THE CHARACTER OF BONIFACE VIII.

ONE of the objects for which Boniface had the greatest concern was the redemption of the Holy Land from the power of the Moslem. He declared in so many words that it had the very greatest hold on his heart.¹ He wanted to go in person with our King Edward to succour the Christians in Palestine who, especially since the fall of Acre, were suffering the greatest oppression.² According to one of our historians, it was for "the happy and speedy settlement of the affairs of the Holy Land for which we long with most ardent desire",³ that he had striven to amass wealth. As he told the people at Anagni at the time when his palace was plundered, he had gathered together the great sums which they saw for the sake of the liberation of the Holy Land to which he had had in mind to go without delay in person with a powerful army.⁴

Boniface's
zeal for the
Crusade.

Boniface, however, was not a man to sit still and idly wish for what he wanted. He took steps to get it. One

James of
Aragon,
Captain-
general.

¹ In conferring a favour on the Templars in recognition of their zeal for the Holy Land, he added: "quod potissime insidet cordi nostro." Ep. of Nov. 30, 1301, *Reg.*, n. 4199.

² See a letter of his quoted by Rishanger, *Annales Angliæ et Scotiæ*, pp. 400-1, R. S. "Qui (the Christians) miserrime et inaudito supplicio a paganis . . . opprimuntur."

³ *Reg.*, n. 1586, Apr. 13, 1296, or Raynaldus, 1296, n. 19, where, by mistake, we find Aug. 13. "Ad cujus (the affair of the Holy Land) promotionem felicem celerem votis ferventibus anhelamus."

⁴ Walter of Hemingburgh, *Chron.*, ii, 230, ed. C. Hamilton.

of the steps which he took early in his pontificate for the redemption of the Holy Land was to make James II. of Aragon the Standard-bearer of the Church. Convinced of the rising naval power of that kingdom, and overwhelmed with sorrow at the sight of the "Lord's inheritance" being denuded of its Christian inhabitants, and abandoned by its defenders,¹ he appointed James "captain and admiral" of all the navy of sixty galleys which was to be built at the expense of the Church. The ships were to be built in King James' dockyards, and were to be used for the help of the Holy Land or against the rebels of the Church. The King was to be responsible for the manning of the galleys; but the Pope would provide twenty-five thousand solidi of the current money of Barcelona every four months for each properly equipped galley. It was also arranged that, in the event of a general expedition to the Holy Land, James should not be bound to accompany it, should there take part in it a Prince with whom he was at enmity. A grant of tithes was to be made to him when he was ready to proceed to Palestine.

For the time being, however, the needs of the Kingdom of Naples or anxieties for the recovery of Sicily were allowed by Boniface to absorb the attention of James and the energies of his sailors.²

Help wanted
for Armenia,
1298.

But, even if he wished, Boniface was not able for long to forget the necessities of the Christian East. Envoys came to him from Sembat, King of Lesser Armenia. With the complete collapse of Christian power in Palestine, his kingdom was in danger of being crushed

¹ Ep. of Jan. 20, 1297, ap. *Reg.*, 2337, and in full ap. Lünig, *Cod. Ital. diplom.*, iv, p. 1379. "Numquid igitur nos . . . possumus cohibere lachrymas . . . videntes . . . terram sanctam, funiculum . . . hæreditatis dominicæ depopulatam immaniter incolis Christifidelibus . . . et a propriis defensoribus derelictam."

² Cf. *supra*, p. 82 f. Cf. *Reg.*, nn. 2338-41.

by his Moslem foes. His envoys begged the help of the Pope for his devoted son. In his reply to the King, Boniface exhorted him to bear up until help could reach him. He assured Sembat that he was devoting his attention to the requirements of his harassed realm, and was urging the Kings of France and England, whom he trusted he had now reconciled, to go to his help.¹ This we know he did. He recommended Sembat's envoys to the two Kings, and told them that, "so it was said," the Kingdom of Armenia was near the Holy Land. Hence, as it would be a useful base when the attempt to recover the latter was made, they should do all they could to help it.²

In returning an answer to the letter of the Armenian patriarch Gregory, on the same subject, Boniface said that he noted that he had begged the Pope to work for peace among the Latins themselves, so that they might be able to come to the help of the Armenians. "God is our witness," continued the Pontiff, "that from the very beginning of our promotion to the Apostolic dignity, among the other cares of our office, we have devoted anxious thought and study to the work of making peace between the western kings and princes, especially among those who have been most eager to fight readily and usefully for the Holy Land." And now by God's grace, he continued, he has made peace between his most dear sons Edward of England and Philip of France, and has secured the co-operation of James of Aragon for the recovery of Sicily. For this last purpose, he has devoted "immense thought and sleepless nights", and has spent large sums of money, because he believed its recovery would be of the greatest advantage to the general Crusade. "Aspiring with all the powers of our mind to direct this

Reply of
Boniface to
its patriarch.

¹ Ep. of Oct. 5, 1298, ap. *Reg.*, 2653.

² *Ib.*, 2654. The Pope's letter to Edward is given in full in Rymer, ii, p. 830.

Crusade, we are making all the preparations we can for it." He, in fine, exhorted the patriarch to bear up till the time of help came, which, by God's mercy, "will be sooner than is generally supposed." Meantime, he exhorts the patriarch to have a care to render his people strong in the faith of the holy Roman Church.¹

Replies of
Edward.

On the heels of the Dominican "James of England", and his companion who were the envoys from Armenia, came a Templar begging help for the oppressed Christians of Palestine.² Boniface, accordingly, sent all three of them to Edward in the hope that their personal narratives would move him. In this expectation he was not disappointed. An English chronicler assures us that the King and all who heard them were more moved than they had ever been before by such accounts.³ But, even though much affected by the tales of woe to which he had listened, Edward gave no direct answer. No doubt, in view of the scheming of Philip, he could not say definitely what he would do. He, therefore, merely said he would follow the Pope's exhortation as soon as the times permitted, and with his nobles, would meanwhile carefully consider it.⁴

Victories of
the Khan of
Persia,
1299-1300.

In the same year in which Edward interviewed the envoys of the King of Armenia, that sovereign, with the King of Georgia, had given their help to Ghazan, the Mongol Khan of Persia (1295-1304), and the allies had inflicted a severe defeat on the Moslems at Homs (Emesa), in Syria, on Dec. 23, 1299.⁵ They entered Damascus on Jan. 2, 1300, and a raid put them for a brief space in possession of Jerusalem. Ghazan, who had long been

¹ Ep. Oct. 26, 1298, *Reg.*, 2663.

² Rishanger, p. 400.

³ *Ib.*

⁴ *Ib.*, p. 401, and his written replies to the Pope, the King of Armenia, and Ralph, patriarch of Jerusalem on Apr. 29, 1299, see Rymer, ii, 831. The date, Apr. 29, comes from the *Calendar of Close Rolls* (1296-1302), p. 305.

⁵ *Cf. supra*, Vol. XVII, p. 61 ff.

endeavouring to secure the co-operation of "the Franks", lost no time in notifying his victory to the Pope, and begged him to see to it that the Christians who had been expelled from the Holy Land should return at once and rebuild their destroyed cities.¹

Boniface was overjoyed at the news of the success of the Mongols and their Christian allies, and proclaimed a "public station". The Roman people were as enthusiastic as the Pope, and we are told that in thanksgiving the whole people in joyful procession visited the thresholds of the Saints.²

Boniface
urges
immediate
aid, Apr.,
1300.

Realizing that the golden opportunity had come and that no time was to be lost in making use of it, Boniface bade the Princes of the West not to wait for "the general passage", but to rush men out to Palestine at once. "News," he wrote to Edward, "great, glorious, and reliable" has come from the East. To shame Christian sloth, God has inspired one who has not been baptized to attack "the principal enemy of the Cross". He has been victorious and has restored the Holy Land to the Christians. Under the circumstances, then, he continued, he thought it best that Crusaders should not wait for the assembling of the great expedition, but should betake themselves to Palestine at once.³

Whatever effects the words of Boniface had on individuals, they certainly had no practical effect on Edward and Philip. About a year after the dispatch of "Nova grandia", the Pope sent another long and eloquent letter to Edward on the same subject. He expressed bitter regret that the peace he had made

¹ Cf. *Gesta Boemundi arch. Trever.*, c. 30, ap. *M. G. SS.*, xxiv, 483. "Iherosolimorumque regno sue ditioni subacto."

² *Ib.* The author of the *Gesta* blames the apathy of the Christian Princes for allowing one ignorant of the faith to be its most valiant champion.

³ Ep. of Apr. 7, 1300, ap. Rymer, ii, p. 862, "Nova grandia."

between England and France had not borne its full fruit, and blamed Edward severely for neglecting the general good for the sake "of a particle of the kingdom of France". He then implored him at least to take steps to keep what the Tartars had won, and for the time, at any rate, to give way to the King of France who was but a mere youth seduced by evil counsels and flattery.¹

Then, with a view to help the King to find the ways and means, he listened to the request which he had, of course, made for tithes. Boniface made over to him all the tenths and moneys he had received on behalf of the Crusade and absolved him from the consequences of having made illegal imposts on the Church.²

Enterprise of
the matrons
of Genoa,
1301.

If, however, Boniface did not get any satisfaction from Edward or Philip, his eloquent and statesmanlike appeals for an alliance with the Tartars elsewhere fell on good, if on somewhat new soil. A number of noble ladies of Genoa proposed to equip a fleet for the Holy Land at their own expense, and even to accompany it themselves. Behold, wrote the Pope to the Franciscan friar, Porchetto Spinola, the administrator of the church of Genoa, behold a miraculous prodigy! Women anticipate men in readiness to help the Holy Land. Powerful kings, even when invited, shrink from the task, and weak women of their own accord come forward with offers of help! Such a shining example must not, added the Pope, be put under a bushel. Friar Porchetto, therefore, was ordered to proclaim it before all the people of Genoa so that others might follow their glorious lead.³

The ladies themselves, Darias, Grimaldis, etc., were

¹ Ep. of Feb. 26, 1301, *ib.*, p. 876 ff. "Ipse (Philip) fervore juventutis impulsus, pravis seductus consiliis, et adulatorum malitia instigatus."

² Ep. of Feb. 26, 1301, *ap. ib.* "Eximie devotionis"; and ep. of March 12, *ap. ib.*, p. 882, or *ap. Letters from N. Registers*, p. 147, R. S.

³ *Reg.*, n. 4380, Aug. 9, 1301.

cordially thanked for their noble generosity,¹ and the men who had offered to command the fleet were exhorted to have it ready in the autumn. One of the latter, Benedict Zacharia, who was an old friend of the Pope,² with one of his fellow nobles was asked by the Pope to come to him a little before the fleet finally put to sea in order that they might get from him all information about the state of affairs.³

To the words of the Pope were soon added appealing exhortations of Tartar envoys under the leadership of the indefatigable Buscarel.⁴ Again they went from one Western potentate to another, and again got nothing but conditional promises of help in the future. The last we hear of these envoys is that, on August 12, 1303, they dined with Charles II. of Naples.⁵

Arrival of
Tartar
envoys,
1301-2.

The golden opportunity was lost—but not through the fault of Pope Boniface VIII. The vaulting ambition of Edward I. and the mean selfishness of the fair Philip threw away perhaps the finest chance the Christians of the West ever had of advancing the best interests of civilization by dealing a decisive blow against the power of the Moslem.

We cannot leave the East without referring to the fact that Boniface, despite what some have said to the contrary, interested himself in the missionary work which was being carried out at this time by the friars. His Register furnishes us with a letter which he addressed to a number of Dominicans who, "as our messengers," were setting out "to the lands of the Saracens, Pagans,

Missionary
effort.

¹ *Ib.*, n. 4384.

² *Ib.*, n. 4382. "Qui fuisti nobis familiarior ab antiquo."

³ *Ib.* Cf. other letters, nn. 4381, 4383-6, ordering the Crusade to be preached in the whole state of Genoa, the usual indulgences to be offered, etc.

⁴ Cf. *supra*, Vol. XVII, p. 64.

⁵ Cf. M. Riccio, *Notiz. Stor. tratte da 62 reg. Ang.*, p. 112.

and Greeks, to the lands of the Bulgarians, Cumans, Ethiopians, Syrians, Iberians, Alans, Gazari, Goths, Zicchi (Zichorum), Ruthenians, Jacobites, Nubians, Nestorians, Georgians, Armenians, Indians, Mosceliti (?), and Tartars, and to other Eastern and Northern nations." As some nations, wrote the Pope, know not Jesus Christ, and some, *sons of subtraction*, are disobedient to the Holy Roman Church, Christ's vicar has chosen a number "of religious men, divinely gifted with virtue and endowed with learning", in order that these nations and these "sons of subtraction" may, "by the antidote of illuminating preaching, be converted to Him who is the true light."¹

Boniface
favours the
friars.

Since their institution by Saints Dominic and Francis, there had ever been a number of friars "gifted with virtue and endowed with learning". For that reason, therefore, and because they had ever shown themselves ready to fall in with the wishes of the Popes, they had regularly been favoured by them. Boniface was no exception to the rule. As a simple notary, he had helped Nicholas III. to draw up the famous bull "*Exiit qui seminat*" for the benefit of the Friars Minor. Solemnly promulgated by Nicholas through Benedict Gaetani who had drawn it up,² the latter, when Pope, incorporated it in his *Sextus Decretalium*, and so "rendered it authentic before the whole world".³

In his care for the Franciscans, he made a number of wise rules for them. Monks or friars, he decreed, from other Orders were not to be admitted to their ranks without the permission of their superiors. And if he gave

¹ *Reg.*, n. 3355, Apr. 10, 1299. See a corresponding letter to the Franciscans, ap. Wadding, *Annales*, v, p. 345, May 15, 1296.

² "*Qui eam dictaverat.*" Cf. *Catal. Gen. Minist. O.M.*, c. 9, ap. *M. G. SS.*, xxxi, p. 667.

³ *Ib.* He inserted "*Exiit*" under tit. "*De verborum signif.*," lib. v, tit. 12, c. 3. See *Mart. Pol. contin. Anglic.*, ap. *M. G. SS.*, xxiv, p. 254.

special authority for the punishment of delinquents and regulated their absolution,¹ it appears from Luke Wadding, the great historian of the Franciscans, that he often employed them in legations and in the government of churches.² He confirmed their exemption from the local ordinaries which had been granted by his predecessors and which, he declared, had resulted in great good for souls.³ Moreover, on February 18, 1300, he issued an important decree with a view to lessen the disputes between parish priests and the friars relative to preaching, hearing confessions, etc.⁴ He permitted the Franciscans and Dominicans to preach in their own churches and in the public squares except at times when the local ordinary was to preach. The superiors of the Orders were to present suitable candidates to the bishops, and then with their permission they could hear confessions. If a bishop, however, should altogether refuse to grant them permission, then by the plenitude of the Apostolic power, he himself gave them the desired permission. On condition that they paid suitable dues to the parish priests, they might also have the right to bury in their own churches or cemeteries.

This decree did not unfortunately put an end to the disputes on these matters between the seculars and regulars. The latter did not think the decree went far

¹ Cf. "Statuta Generalia", ap. *Mon. Francisc.*, ii, pp. 84, 97, 99, R. S.

² *Ann. Minor.*, vol. v, *passim*, after p. 331. See also Eubel, *Bullar. Francisc. Epitome*, nn. 2145, 2148-9, etc. See also *ib.*, n. 2098, and n. 2000, where he decrees that other mendicant orders may not build monasteries nearer Franciscan ones than "ultra spatium 140 cannarum". Cf., however, 2033, where we see the Franciscans breaking this rule against the Dominicans. See also n. 2147.

³ *B. F. E.*, n. 2039, Nov. 11, 1295, "Inter ceteros ordines." Cf. 2034.

⁴ Decree "Super cathedram", ap. *ib.*, n. 2157, or Wadding, v, p. 340 ff. Cf. *B. F. E.*, n. 2209.

enough, and it was revoked by the Dominican Pope Benedict XI. It was, however, reaffirmed by Clement V. at the Council of Vienne.¹

Boniface
restrains the
religious.

Although properly favourable to the recognized Mendicant Orders, Boniface would not suffer them to go beyond the decree "Super cathedram".² Nor would he allow them to settle down anywhere they chose. They had to get apostolic permission before they could occupy any premises,³ and were, moreover, strictly to observe any ecclesiastical agreements into which they had entered.⁴ Hearing, too, that some Franciscan inquisitors had, in the course of their duty, been guilty in the March of Treviso, and adjoining localities, of certain excesses, he promptly suspended the whole Order in those parts.⁵ On the other hand, he ordered Franciscan inquisitors to proceed, even with the aid of the secular arm, against the Bizochi and others (i.e., against the Fraticelli) who not belonging to any recognized religious Order were spreading a variety of errors throughout the Abruzzi and the adjoining territories.⁶

Reinstates
Benedic-
tines.

In his care for religious, Boniface did not confine his attention to the new Orders. He did not forget the old ones. Accordingly we see him restoring to Monte Cassino those Benedictine monks whom Pope Celestine V. had expelled because, says one of our monastic annalists, they had been unwilling to desert the original rule of

¹ Wadding, *ib.*, p. 343. Benedict withdrew it: "favore ordinis sui" says Eberhard, *Annales Ratispon.*, ap. *M. G. SS.*, xvii, p. 599. Cf. *ib.*, p. 598.

² *B. F. E.*, nn. 2183-4, 2198.

³ *Ib.*, n. 2100.

⁴ *Ib.*, n. 2101.

⁵ *Ib.*, 2188, June 1, 1302.

⁶ *Ib.*, n. 2106, May 7, 1297. Of these Fraticelli, while some were out and out scoundrels playing on the simplicity of the people, others, as we have said, like John Peter Olivi († 1299), were well-intentioned but misguided fanatics. Cf. Tosti, pp. 173-81, and pp. 251-3; and as an authority for some of the wild doings of these Fraticelli mentioned by Tosti, see Jordanus, *Chron.*, p. 1020, ap. Muratori, *Antiq.*, iv.

St. Benedict, and embrace "the indiscreet statutes which he had evolved out of his own heart".¹

Although, with some modifications, Boniface had confirmed the constitution of Gregory X. which forbade the founding of new Orders,² he nevertheless approved of the Order of the "brothers or canons" hospitaller of the Order of St. Anthony.³ However, as he gave the brothers the rule of St. Augustine, they became branch of an old Order rather than a new one. In accordance with the ancient custom of the hospital, near Arles, in which the Order took its rise, Boniface ordered that the brothers should wear a habit on which was the emblem T, "which they call *potentia*." Some suppose this sign to be the last letter of the Hebrew alphabet (Thau or Tau), which had the form of a cross, and was the sign which, according to Ezechiel (ix, 4 ff.), was to save those marked with it. Others suppose it was a crutch (*potence*).⁴

The new Order doing good work for the sick soon became rich by the offerings made to it. With riches came corruption, and Dante (*Paradiso*, xxix), rails so bitterly against them⁵ that it has been supposed that he was hitting at Pope Boniface who sanctioned the Order. But of this his earliest commentator, Benvenuto da Imola, knows nothing.⁶

¹ *Ann. de Wigornia*, p. 521, R. S.

² Eubel, n. 2137, May 5, 1298.

³ Decree of May 18, 1297, ap. *Bullar.*, iv, 143.

⁴ Here Ducange, *sub voce*, quotes a phrase from a MS. to the effect that a certain man "*nec poterat ambulare nisi cum potentiis sive crossis*".

⁵

"Saint Anthony

Fattens with this (false promises) his swine, and others worse
Than swine who died at his lazy board."

⁶ He simply says that St. Anthony fattens his swine with gifts: "*pagando di moneta senza conio: con tali offerte impinguano i frati corrotti di moneta senza conio*," vol. iii, pp. 505-6, Ital. trans., ed. Tamburini.

Boniface incurs the dislike of some monks and friars.

Because Boniface held the balance fairly between the religious and the seculars, but was not afraid to blame or even punish where justice required condemnation, he incurred the censure of some narrow-minded individual writers in the former body. Because, in St. John Lateran's, he had replaced the Augustinian canons on account of their evil and useless lives by secular canons,¹ or for other similar acts, Boniface was accused of being hostile to monks and religious. His dislike of them, says the author of the *Annals of Worcester*, is proved by the fact that in certain "noble churches" he replaced regulars by seculars—"contrary," he adds, "to the evangelical statutes!"² Again, while speaking for the Friars Minor, brother Glassberger says, correctly, that Boniface loved them, the author of the *Liber de conformitate*³ assures us that he was about to issue bulls to destroy them, when he was seized by the Colonnas and his bulls were burnt!

John Grand, archbishop of of Lund.

The last important series of acts performed by Boniface VIII. on which we purpose to touch is that concerned with his efforts to uphold the rights of the Church in Denmark, and to obtain justice for the archbishop of Lund. John Grand became metropolitan of Denmark in 1290, and had to deal with King Eric VIII., Menved, the high-handed son of a dishonoured and dishonourable father. Danish and foreign modern historians are not agreed as to the merits of the quarrel which soon arose between the King and the archbishop. The Danish historian, Allen, accepts as true the charges brought against John Grand by Eric.⁴ He, accordingly,

¹ Ep. of Sept. 3, 1299, ap. *Bullar.*, iv, p. 155 ff. He calls this basilica among other churches of the world "velut caput ipsarum antiquitatis, dignitatis, ac nobilitatis prærogativa fulgentem."

² *Ann. de Wigornia*, p. 532, R. S.

³ I, p. 438.

⁴ See the whole *process* before Pope Boniface, which occupies about 100 folio pages in Langebek, *SS. Dan.*, vi, p. 275 ff.

accuses the archbishop of being in league with the nobility in an effort to crush the royal power, and of entering into treasonable correspondence with the King of Norway, and adds that Eric suspected him of being privy to the assassination of his father, Eric Glipping.¹ Krarup, however, accepting the defence of the archbishop, attributes the dissension between Eric and the archbishop to the desire of the former for the property of the Church,² and Dunham is of opinion that the King was hostile to Grand "for reasons apparently which had no foundation".³ The last named author is probably correct; for, if Eric had been able to substantiate his reasons for his enmity towards John Grand, Boniface would never have supported the archbishop as he did.

However all that may be, the archbishop excommunicated the King and his advisers (complices). Thereupon, along with his provost, James Lang, he was seized by the King's brother, Christopher, was imprisoned in the castle of Sgoburgh, and, according to all accounts, was most cruelly treated, Apr. 9, 1294.⁴ After well over a year's confinement, he managed to escape, and made his way to the Roman curia with the Pope's nuncio, Isarnus.⁵

¹ *Hist. de Danemark*, i, p. 175 f. Cf. A. Crichton, *Scandinavia*, i, p. 274.

² *Hist. de l'église cath. de Danemark*, p. 80.

³ *Hist. of Denmark, etc.*, ii, p. 233. Thus he was suspected of favouring the assassination seemingly merely: "quia erat de genere illorum qui regem occiderant." Cf. *Annales Ripenses*, an. 1289, ap. *Annales Danici*, ed. Jørgensen, p. 153.

⁴ Cf. the *Processus* before the Roman curia. *Ann. Nestvedienses*, *Lundenses*, etc., ap. *ib.*, pp. 126, 127. Cf. *Hist. archiepisc. Bremensium*, ap. Lappenberg, *Geschichtsquellen von Bremen*, or (for the life of J. G., written in verse, which for the moment alone concerns us) ap. J. Langebek, *SS. Rer. Danicarum*, vi, p. 266 ff. This metrical life was written by a contemporary.

⁵ *Ann. Ripenses*, p. 154. As he only escaped "on the night after the feast of St. Lucy (Dec. 13, 1295), those authors are justified who say

He is taken prisoner.

The latter, the archpriest of Carcassonne, had been sent to Eric by Pope Boniface in August, 1295. He was the bearer of a letter to the King in which Boniface begged him to restore the primate of Sweden to liberty, seeing that "his unbecoming and harsh (*injurius*) imprisonment was displeasing to God, was upsetting the Church,¹ and was scandalizing the faithful." Eric was also asked to send envoys to Rome in order that "his own condition and that of his kingdom which had been seriously shaken by the manifold disorders which had sprung up within it, might be advantageously steadied by the experienced prudence of the Apostolic See".²

John Grand
in Rome,
1296.

Eric had taken no notice of a protest from Pope Celestine V.³ But when the archbishop reached Rome, a very different "High Priest" sat on the chair of Peter; and while in Sweden, Eric was plundering his property and dishonouring his friends, Boniface was receiving him "like a sheep who had given its wool for the general good"—at least, so, in rhyming verse, says his biographer.⁴ Never, declared the Pope, according to the same authority, had he seen a man like to him, one who was a terror to

he was in prison even for two years. *Cf. Chron. Jutensis*, ap. *ib.*, p. 160, and the metrical *life* :—

"Sicque per biennium carcere tenetur."

¹ The local church was certainly being upset; for taking advantage of his difficulties, Nicholas Allonis, archbishop of Upsala, tried to free himself from the jurisdiction of his metropolitan, and to be dependent on the Pope directly. He accordingly managed to obtain his pallium from Boniface, who, however, in sending it (Aug. 17, 1295) by the hands of John, cardinal-bishop of Tusculum, added "saving the rights of the Church of Lund which declares that it has primatial rights over Upsala." Potthast, nn. 24167–8.

² *Ib.*, nn. 24169–70; Raynaldus, *Ann.*, 1295, n. 50.

³ *Cf.* the last authority :—

"Celestinus pontifex summus non timetur."

⁴ "Quem (J. G.) recepit pontifex tanquam ovem sanam
Qui pro publico suam dedit lanam." *P.* 267.

his enemies, "whom money could not change nor threats terrify."

Realizing that he would have to try to defend himself, Eric sent proctors to Rome, one of whom was a Master Martin who had studied Canon Law at Paris and had written on the subject.¹ The case was tried before two cardinal-priests, John, the monk of SS. Peter and Marcellinus, and Nicholas de Nonancour of St. Lawrence in Damaso,² and the archbishop himself accused the King, through his brother Christopher, of violently arresting and ill-treating him, and of damaging the property of the archdiocese, and that of the archbishop himself. For these and other injuries he claimed damages to the extent of over two hundred thousand marks of silver.³ The answers of the King's proctors were weak. They did not believe that the King had seized or even ordered the archbishop to be seized. As a very suspicious person, he had permitted him to be captured. He was suspected by Eric inasmuch as he had always shown favour to the murderers of the King's father, who were his relations and friends, and he was in touch with the King's enemies. Hence, as the Holy See was vacant at the time and the King was young and inexperienced, it was not possible to wait for communications from Rome, and so he permitted the arrest. If, in his capture, the archbishop had been ill-treated, it was not with the knowledge of the King, but, *perchance*, with the connivance of some nobles whom the archbishop had provoked.⁴

¹ The metrical *life*, *l.c.*, and the royal decree (May 5, 1296), nominating him, ap. the Process, p. 275. According to the former, the King bade Martin not to spare money in his cause.

² The process (*P.*), p. 279.

³ Incidentally, J. G. accused the King of debasing the coinage, *P.*, p. 281.

⁴ *P.*, pp. 283-4.

Eric sends envoys to Rome, 1296.

The reply of the King's proctors regarding the archbishop's property was nothing short of insolent. Of course the King knew nothing about the robbery of the archbishop's property. If it had been robbed it was no doubt by the said nobles, and if there was as much in it as was said, it was a pity that he had not previously given it to the poor.

It is impossible here to go through all the accusations made by the archbishop, and the replies and counter-charges of treason¹ of the King's agents, but we may add that the King's proctors, always stressing their master's youth,² urge that the treasonable practices of the archbishop are such that the King knows not how to cope with them, and so he implores the clemency of Boniface to help him, as his predecessors have in the past often helped those of the King.³ On the other hand, among many other accusations brought against the King by the archbishop's advocate, was one to the effect that he had done to death the virtuous archbishop James, who had formerly been a chaplain and an intimate friend (*commensalis*) of Pope Innocent IV. Besides, towards the end of his reply to the countercharges brought by Master Martin against the archbishop, the latter's advocate accused his opponent of hopeless inconsistency. If the archbishop was such a man as he contended, why had he at the time of the election said in public Consistory before the lord Pope, that John Grand was more worthy of the archiepiscopal dignity than anyone else in the whole kingdom?⁴

¹ *Ib.*, p. 290 ff.

² This the archbishop's advocate properly refused to allow, showing that he was 24 or 25 years of age. *P.*, 302.

³ *Ib.*, p. 294. "Sicut sæpe sui gratia sancta sedes Apostolica consimilibus malis suos progenitores olim prementibus vel finem vel frenum ponere consuevit."

⁴ *P.*, p. 304.

Judgment was given in favour of the archbishop, and Boniface decided, seemingly about the beginning of the year 1299, that King Eric had to pay forty-nine thousand marks of pure silver (according to the standard of Lund) to the archbishop and the Church of Lund as damages; and that he and his successors were to respect the archbishop of Lund and the rights of the Church. He also declared that all concerned in the seizing of archbishop John were to be publicly declared excommunicated till they had made reparation and been absolved by the Holy See.¹

Judgment
given for
the arch-
bishop, 1299.

Then as King Eric had already asked for release from the excommunication he had incurred, Master Isarnus was sent back to Denmark, to remove the excommunication, and to reconcile the King and the archbishop, Apr., 1299.²

When, however, Eric found how much the trial had gone against him, he flatly refused to submit to the Pope's decision. Among other things, he declared that he could not raise enough money to pay the fine imposed upon him.³ Accordingly, for over two years more, he continued to despise the sentence of excommunication.⁴

Eric refuses
to submit to
the sentence.

Negotiations, however, continued in the meanwhile; and Eric made various offers to the archbishop who either was not of a very accommodating disposition or had been embittered against the King by the cruel treatment he had received.⁵ In despair, Eric wrote a most submissive

Peace at
last, 1302.

¹ *Ib.*, pp. 328-9.

² See the letters of Boniface to his chaplain Isarnus, archpriest of Carcassone, ap. *Reg.*, 3037-9, Apr. 18, 1299.

³ *Process*, p. 329.

⁴ Eric . . . "sententiam . . . nec non et excommunicationis et interdicti sententias . . . vilipendat . . . per biennium et ultra." *Ib.*, p. 331.

⁵ See, for instance, *ib.*, p. 347, where Eric offered J. G. in payment for such of his property as he had not by that time recovered not only all his

letter to the Pope imploring him to remove the interdict, as he feared the defection of his people.¹ While still asserting that the archbishop had ever shown himself the friend of his father's murderers, and of the King's enemies, he averred that, out of reverence for the Apostolic See, he had been willing, but quite unable, to come to an understanding with him. He, therefore, begged the Vicar of Christ to put back the sword of Peter into its sheath and to restore to him the sacraments of the Church, and he promised to accept any burden, however heavy, that his shoulders could possibly bear.

Naturally touched by such an appeal, Boniface, while insisting on the restoration of the property of the see as it was at the time of the arrest of its archbishop, reduced the fine to ten thousand marks, and ordered the removal of the interdict and excommunications (Feb. 20, 1302). Then, convinced that the King and the archbishop were never likely to live in peace and amity, he transferred the latter to the see of Riga (March 30, 1302), and replaced him by its archbishop, no other than the nuncio Isarnus (Apr. 11).² John, however, would not accept the

movables, but, leaving enough for his decent maintenance, all his revenues "donec sibi plenarie satisfactum juxta Apostolicarum litterarum continentiam".

¹ Ep. ap. *ib.*, p. 350. Eric found the Pope's sentence "hard"—"if one may say so," and spoke "ex periculo . . . populi proni ad labendum".

² "Papa petit ut præsul resignet præsulatum
Cum habere nequeat tutum sibi statum,
Promisit quod faciat majorem prælatum
Ubicumque videre fore sibi gratum." The metrical *life*, p. 267. Cf. Epp., nn. 814–16, ap. *Regesta diplom. hist. Danicæ*, p. 132, Copenhagen, 1889. With this arrangement, John Grand was, perhaps not unnaturally, by no means content; and so finally Clement V. appointed him to the more important see of Bremen, Feb. 11, 1310. *Ib.*, n. 941. Cf. n. 854, for a bull of Benedict XI. (March 21, 1304), where we are told that "hanc translationem (from Lund to Riga) de se factam acceptare

translation, so that Benedict XI. had to provide the see of Riga with an incumbent (March 21, 1304), and it was not till several years afterwards that he got another see, that of Bremen.¹

Whether Eric deserved the Pope's consideration may be doubted ; for within a year, we find Boniface ordering the new archbishop to excommunicate a vassal of the King for robbing and imprisoning a deacon on his way to Rome, unless the King, by whose orders the crime was done, restores the stolen property and compensates the deacon for the injuries inflicted on him.²

Now that we have narrated at sufficient length the actions of Benedict Gaetani, Pope Boniface VIII., we may ask what judgment ought to be passed upon them. What position should be assigned to him in the long splendid line of the Pontiffs of Rome ? ³ Has he to be placed on the Lord's right or left hand ?

What is to be finally said of Boniface ?

With regard to most people who have some sort of acquaintance with the chief characters of the Middle Ages, we have no hesitation in saying that, before they attempt to pass a final verdict on the character of Boniface, they must firmly banish from their minds a

noluisse (J. G.) ". From a brief of Benedict (Nov. 7, 1303) it appears that by that date Eric and his brother had not yet been absolved. Cf. *Reg. B. XI.*, n. 27. Cf. nn. 26 and 30.

¹ Cf. *Reg. Bened. XI.*, n. 594 and the preceding note.

² *Reg. D.*, n. 836, March 27, 1303. Cf. *Ann. Lubicensis*, ap. *M. G. SS.*, xvi, p. 420.

³ Of the powers of his mind we need not add to what we have already said. However, we will give one more note on the subject from Arnald of Villanova, himself a man of superior attainments : " De persona quoque pontificis omnis lingua resonabat communiter, quod vigeat in ea intellectualitatis aquilina perspicacia, scientiarum eminens peritia, cunctorum agibilibus exquisita prudentia, in agrediendis arduis audacia leonina, in prosequendis difficilibus stabilis constantia," ap. Finke, *Aus den Tagen*, p. clxxviii.

very large proportion of the ideas they have picked up about him. The fresh documents which have been brought to light in comparatively recent times, and the better comprehension of those previously known, enable us definitely to state that many of the most serious charges, once almost universally laid against Pope Boniface, are certainly false. It is, for instance, assuredly historically untrue, and we believe we have shown it to be so, that he had any undue or improper share whatsoever in bringing about the resignation of his predecessor, Pope Celestine V. It is equally untrue that he had any share in that Pope's death. In his own life it is not to be believed that he lived as a heretic¹; nor in death did he die mad, gnawing his flesh like a dog.² Moreover, in view of the clear and most emphatic declaration of Boniface himself as to the independence of the civil power and in view of the utterly second-rate evidence on which they rest, all the stories about his having donned imperial insignia and called himself Emperor, are baseless figments of hostile Ghibelline imagination. For, as Arnold of Villanova, the metaphysical physician of Boniface, declared to Pope Benedict XI., the memory of

¹ With King James II. of Aragon, who knew him, it must be said that the charge that he was stained with heresy is "utterly incredible and horrible". "Hoc (the said charge) incredibilis suscepimus et orribile reputamus." Ep. of March 21, 1309, ap. Finke, *Mon. Arag.*, i, 150.

² As we have said, the *procès verbal* of the opening of his coffin absolutely demonstrated that. On this opening of the sarcophagus of Boniface, see Wiseman, p. 529. Rubæus also, p. 546 ff., gives the *procès*. Don G. Gaetani (*Domus G.*, i, 88) says that, when on Aug. 24, 1832, the sarcophagus of Boniface was reopened, as the cover did not fit well; it was found that the body of the great Pope was reduced to bones and dust. He adds that one of the most precious heirlooms of the family is the bone of one of the hands which on this occasion was removed by Don Filippo Gaetani.

his patient was polluted by his enemies who poured over him a very deluge of opprobrium.¹

Nor is Boniface to be accounted cruel. We see him writing that "his paternal heart holds in horror the shedding of the blood of Christians whom Our Lord Jesus Christ redeemed with his own precious blood".² The case of the Colonnas proves nothing to the contrary. He may not have been merciful to them, but they did everything to deserve punishment, and nothing to deserve mercy. If he was hard towards them, he was no more than just. What was generally felt about their guilt is evidenced in a letter to Benedict XI. published by Baluze.³ The writer expresses his belief that, after they have offered every manifestation of regret for their conduct and absolute submission to the decisions of the Holy See in their regard, some mercy might then perchance be extended to the Colonna cardinals. Greater reserve, he contended, must be exercised in the matter of mercy in the case of Stephen Colonna who is to be accounted the real author of many of the evil deeds wrought against Boniface by King Philip. But, as for Sciarra, concludes the writer, he has richly deserved death; and if he is ultimately to be pardoned, he must never be allowed to return to Rome or its neighbourhood. The writer of this advisory letter was evidently convinced that he was voicing the general opinion, as he asked the Pope not to keep it secret.⁴

On the other hand, if our words reveal our true selves, the violent and overbearing language in which Boniface is credited with having often indulged may be taken as

¹ See his letter to Benedict, ap. Finke, *Aus d. T.*, p. clxxxiii.

² Ep. Nov. 8, 1301, ap. Theiner, *Mon. Hungar.*, i, p. 391, n. 626.

³ *Vitæ PP. Aven.*, ii, p. 14, Paris, 1693.

⁴ "Supplico . . . quod hujusmodi meum consilium non teneatis secretum, quia illud publicare dispono." *Ib.*

proving that he was of a corresponding character.¹ It must, however, be borne in mind that the evidence for a great deal of what Boniface is supposed to have said is not very satisfactory. Much of it is mere gossip. Then the language of a man of ardent and impulsive character who, in the midst of constant bad health has much to try him, does not really mean very much. And, during most of his pontificate, Boniface was a martyr to one form or another of illness. As early as August, 1298, we learn that he was seriously ill. On August 4 he is reported to be a little better²; but, somewhat later in the same month, he is said to be extremely reduced by attacks of fever.³ A few months later, he complains to Philip of France of the burdens of age and long-standing illness.⁴ About a year after this, the Flemish envoys report that he is sick unto death⁵; and again, some four months after, Boniface makes the same complaint to King Edward about age and sickness as he had made to Philip.⁶ In August 1300, we see him speaking of the grievous illness he had had which had left him very weak.⁷ In the summer and autumn of 1301, he was down with gout and stone⁸; but in the spring of 1302, through the skill of

¹ Jacopone in his famous 26th satire, "O Papa Bonifazio," upbraids him with having a foul tongue which spared nobody:—

"O lingua macellara a diciare villania,

Nè emperor, nè rege, chevelle altro che sia,

Da te non se partia

Sença crudil fireire." Ed. Pacheu, p. 320.

² Ep. ap. Finke, *Mon. Arag.*, n. 36, p. 50.

³ *Ib.*, note.

⁴ "Gravis et longa nos egritudo detinuit . . . Jam sentire conspicimur onera senectutis." Ep. ap. Boutaric, *Notices et extraits*, vol. xx, pt. ii, p. 129.

⁵ Ep. July 9, 1299, ap. K. de Lettenhove, p. 63.

⁶ Ep. Nov. 14, 1299, ap. Rymer, ii, 860.

⁷ See the "Gascony" document in *The Eng. Hist. Rev.*, 1902, p. 524.

⁸ Cf. *Calendar of Scottish docs.*, ii, 297, R. S., and Finke, *Aus d. T.*,

that interesting medical theologian, the Catalan, Arnaldo de Villanova,¹ he made such an extraordinary recovery that it was said that his youth had returned to him.² For, in the meanwhile, Arnold had given him some gold seals to carry about and a loin cloth (in which perhaps the seals were sewn) to wear. These things, so Boniface is reported to have said, kept him free of "stones" and other troubles, and enabled him to live.³ Faith in his physician or a natural rally of his constitution wrought a cure in the Pope for a time. However, in the autumn he was ill again.⁴

Boniface, then, must not be judged by any words which pain or the irritation of debility acting on a fiery nature may have caused to spring to his lips, but by his considered utterances, and his fully deliberate actions. Some, indeed, even from these latter, hastily draw the conclusion that he was a man prone haughtily to interfere with the rights of sovereigns, especially with those of the King of France. But to Philip le Bel Boniface could have

pp. xxvii, xxx, and xxxvi. Hence at that time the cards. thought he would die soon. *Mon. Ar.*, p. 104.

¹ Cf. F. Ehrle (now cardinal), "Arnaldo de Villanova ed i Thomatiste," ap. the review *Gregorianum*, July, 1920, p. 478. A. de V. was a good physician, but a very indifferent theologian. By his dabbings in theology he was often in trouble. In fact it was an appeal against the condemnation at Paris of one of his theological tracts: "De tempore adventus Antichristi" that brought him to Rome in 1301. It was his medical skill that finally saved him from worse trouble at the hands of the Pope (Dupuy, p. 331, Finke, *Aus.*, p. xxx, and cxcii ff., cciv). Boniface, however, was highly pleased with what he did for him medically, and is reported to have said that he was the only good Catalan he had known. Finke, *Aus d. T.*, p. xxxvi.

■ Finke, *l.c.*, p. xlvi.

■ This is the interesting passage: "Qui (Ar.) fecit michi sigilla aurea et quoddam bracciale que deffero, et servant me a dolore lapidis et multis aliis doloribus et facit me vivere." The report of Albalato, ap. Finke, *Aus d. T.*, p. xxxvi, cf. p. clxxix.

⁴ Finke, *Mon. Arag.*, n. 83, p. 119.

said, and, in effect, did say, what Blessed Thomas More said to his judge, the Duke of Norfolk: "You have no authority to make a law or Act of Parliament or Council against the union of Christendom."¹ The same great, if not the greatest, Englishman, prayed for Popes "who will bring about peace, and exercise the authority they have received from God against the 'satraps and mighty hunters of the world', excommunicating . . . both those who invade the territories of others and those who oppress their own".² Boniface was, in the main, such a Pope. He may at times have exercised the authority which he had received in part from God and in part from man over-hastily and brusquely; and he may, too, at times, have exercised that authority in a way not altogether becoming in one who claimed to act in a special manner as God's Vicar. Nor can it be denied that Boniface exercised his ill-defined prerogatives as overlord of Christendom in a lordly and masterful manner. To summon Philip of France and Eric of Denmark to answer not merely for specific charges (which may well have been within his competence) but for their general administration was to stretch his prerogatives to breaking point, if not to go wholly beyond them. Nor can there be any reasonable doubt that this attempt to expand the boundaries of his recognized power alienated sympathy

¹ See his noble words after his condemnation to death, ap. Bridgett, *Sir Thos. More*, p. 422.

² *Ib.*, p. 220. In quite a prophetic spirit he added: "With one or two such Popes, the Christian world would soon perceive how much preferable it is that the papacy should be reformed than abrogated." If, as we have already said, Philip had made efforts not to cut himself adrift from the union of Christendom, but to have the temporal authority of the Papacy more exactly defined, the world war of 1914-18 might not have occurred. That other princes besides Boniface were scandalized at the "anti-Christendom" action of Philip is clear from the words of James II. of Aragon. Cf. Finke, *Mon. Arag.*, nn. 91-3, 95, 96.

from him, and injured the cause of the temporal influence of the Church which he had rightly so much at heart.¹ But, speaking generally, his aims were noble, and were, with high motives, ably directed to the good of Christendom.

No doubt, his successes were not equal to his heroic efforts. This was due, partly, it must be confessed, to his own fault, to occasional rashness in act and expression,² and to his very human weakness for the advancement of his family,³ but it was due much more to the changing spirit of the times over which he had no control.

With Princes still continuing to place themselves and their countries under the protection of the Holy See,⁴ and, like Guy of Flanders, strongly affirming his presidency of the European commonwealth, and with certain prelates and canon lawyers around him, like the saintly bishop, James of Viterbo, and Henry of Cremona, putting forward his temporal position in too absolute a manner,⁵ Boniface

¹ Cf. Boutaric, *La France*, pp. 113-14.

² In language very easily able to be misunderstood he speaks of the Pope: "qui omnia jura in scrinio pectoris sui censetur habere" (*Sext. Decret.*, lib. i, tit. ii, c. 1), and who "super omnes mortales obtinens principatum" (a word of decidedly ambiguous meaning). Ep. of Oct. 17, 1301, ap. Raynaldus, *Annal.*, 1301, n. 7.

³ See how envoys at his court ascribe his conduct in certain cases to his wish to advance his nephew, Peter. Cf. Finke, *Aus d. T.*, pp. xlv and lvi.

⁴ See the case of Bolco, duke of Silesia, ap. Potthast, 24273-6.

⁵ One of Henry's propositions is thus baldly stated: "Et quod papa habeat dominium super imperium probatur hoc modo." *De potestate papæ*, p. 465, ap. Scholz. Cf. p. 469, "Hoc eciam est de necessitate nature, scilicet, quod papa sit solus dominus universalis in toto mundo, quia omnes fideles sunt una ecclesia." On bishop James and his book, dedicated to Boniface, as "the sacred prince of the Kings of the earth"—see Rivi re, p. 145 ff. See also the new edition of James' *De regimine Christiano* by H. X. Arquill re, Paris, 1926. It was written 1301-2, and saluted the sacred Paternity of Boniface "que, ad libertatem ecclesiastici regiminis et exaltationem catholice veritatis, prudenter et flagranter invigilat." P. 85. He lays down that all temporal

may be excused for failing to see that the mediaeval conceptions of a united Christendom under the Pope and the Emperor, were beginning to be abandoned, and that the old order was doomed. But, nevertheless, he was a great Pope who struggled gallantly against an unscrupulous and ambitious tyrant¹ to hold the heritage that had been handed down to him.² He made a glorious fight to maintain, possibly to develop, the grand mediaeval view that all Christians, as brethren of Jesus Christ, formed one family whose temporal interests were the concern of the Emperor, and whose spiritual interests were the business of the Pope—who in all difficulties was to be the final resort. In view of the state ambitions which there is now no means of checking, and which resulted in the awful war of 1914-18, may we not say with the best of reasons that it would have been far better for the peace and happiness of the world had the aims of Boniface VIII.

princes should revere and obey the Pope as they would Jesus Christ Himself. P. 237. Cf. p. 238, etc. Jordan of Osnabrück assigns the zenith of papal world influence to the days of Gregory X., when at the Council of Lyons: "ad pedes Romani pontificis non solum populus christianus et prelati ecclesiastici, sed etiam reges mundi, Judei, Greci, Tartari convenientes *recognoverunt Romano sacerdotio mundi monarchiam.*" *Noticia seculi*, p. 671, ed. F. Wilhelm.

¹ Philip's ambition was fanned especially by such publicists as Pierre Dubois, who wished to see the temporal power of the Pope completely suppressed, and universal monarchy in the hands, not of the Emperor, but of the King of France. See his treatise, *De potestate Papæ*, ap. Dupuy, pp. 663-83, and especially his "Summaria et brevis doctrina", still in MS. (Bibl. nat., n. 6622 f.1 ff., Paris), where he goes much further. See extracts in the introduction to his *De recuperatione Terræ S.*, and cf. Rivière, p. 342 ff.

² According to Döllinger, *Hist. of the Ch.*, iv, p. 81, he did this by treating "spiritual things according to the principles of worldly policy", and so he decides that: "Boniface possessed the qualities of a temporal sovereign rather than those of a prince of the Church." There have assuredly been more spiritual-minded pontiffs than Boniface, but we do not believe that Döllinger is justified in asserting "his disregard of the deepest religious relations for which he had no thought".

prevailed rather than those of Edward I. and the fair Philip.

In any case, one cannot well avoid the conclusion of Petrarch, but must agree that Boniface "was powerful and immovable, a man whom it was most difficult to break by force of arms, and impossible to bend by condescension and flattery, whom, in fine, death alone could conquer".¹ He was "the real wonder of peoples and kings, nay, as it is said, of the whole world".² We may be pardoned if we go further, and say with the monk of Fürstenfeld that his "death was a loss to the whole Church; for had he lived longer, his industry would without doubt have put to rights many things in her that stood in need of correction".³ He would, indeed, have been a better Pope had he thought more of the reformation of the Church than of her external glory, and had he remembered that the true glory of the King's daughter is not in gold and jewels, but within.⁴ But, at any rate, "he has at least the eternal glory of having died unconquerable and unconquered without ever having made the smallest concession to error."⁵

So much did the majesty and tragical close of Boniface's life strike the imaginations of his contemporaries that

The
Moralists
and
Boniface.

¹ Epp. fam., ii, n. 3, vol. i, p. 93, ed. Fracassetti.

² *De ocio religiosorum*, ii, p. 314, ed. Basle. "Verus populorum et regum, atque, ut dicitur, orbis stupor." In his *Le Vite degl' imperadori et Pontefici Romani*, p. 275 ff., ed. Florence, 1625, he does not pass any criticism on the character of Boniface, and so, of course, does not say a word against him.

³ Ap. Böhmer, *Fontes*, i, 24. He would have put "many things" right, because, in the words of Renan, "un sentiment supérieur à l'affreuse barbarie de son temps guidait souvent Boniface." *Études*, p. 9.

⁴ Arnold of Villanova averred that Boniface had been heard to say: "I will increase the glory of the Roman Church in gold and silver and every kind of splendid thing so that the memory of me will be glorious for ever and ever." Ap. Finke, p. clxxxiii.

⁵ L. Gautier, *Benott XI.*, p. 14.

the moralist poets of the century in which he died used the career of this "papa imperadore", as they called him, to drive home their views on the little dust in which all human greatness ends. Gaetani¹ cites the effusions of two such poetasters, and we will give a little of one of them in an English version, and a few lines of the other in the original Italian :—

" Whilst on this earth where all doth pass unstayed,
I, Boniface, did hold such mighty sway
That France and Carl d'Anjou to me gave way,
Of me in fear they walked, of me afraid.

All power on earth to me I made obey
But now, confined within that very earth,
I naught can do, to speak the truth alway."

" A ogni potente mi fe ubidire
Quello chi sono non pote fuggire.
Tu huomo che sempre vuogli essere maggiore
Pensa et vedi chome definire."

¹ *Domus G.*, i, pp. 80-1.

BLESSED BENEDICT XI.

A.D. 1303-4.

Sources.—The *Register* of Benedict XI. was very well edited in 1905, Paris, by Ch. Grandjean. All the important letters are printed in full; there is a list of the letters in their proper chronological order, and lastly there is an index to the volume. Though containing over thirteen hundred items—no inconsiderable number for the short reign of Benedict, the *Register* cannot be said to be of proportionate interest for the purposes of general history. Most of the documents deal with dispensations, indulgences, grants for the benefit of the Dominican Order, and the ordinary details of the government of the Church.

Dupuy, *Histoire du différend d'entre le P. Boniface VIII. et Philippe le Bel*, Paris, 1655, is useful also for the pontificate of B. XI.

The most ancient biography of Benedict is the brief one by Bernard Guidonis (ap. *R. I. SS.*, iii, p. 672 f.). He wrote his *Flores Chronicorum* (ap. *R. F. SS.*, xxi, p. 690 ff.), which includes the life of Benedict, in 1311, "after a five years' preparation."¹ He also wrote an account of the miracles wrought at the tomb of Benedict by his intercession. He gives fifteen of them, and says that they had been confirmed on oath before a notary and witnesses convoked in the Dominican Church at Perugia, shortly after Benedict's burial (1304). Many of the cures of the sick related by Bernard had reference to "possession". The account of them had been sent to him "under his seal" from the Curia by brother Geoffrey "de Allusiis", "inquisitor of heretical depravity" at Carcassonne. These miracles, fifteen in number, are printed in the *Analecta Bollandiana*, vol. xix, p. 17 ff., Brussels, 1900, where we are also told that the story of Benedict's refusal to see his mother because she came to him more richly

¹ Cf. L. Delisle, "Notices sur les MSS. de Bern. Gui" in *Notices et extraits des MSS.*, t. xxviii, pt. ii, p. 393. B. G. called himself: "Brother Bernard de Castris S. Vincenti."

dressed than became her station in life is a fable of a later age. The *life* by Amalricus is printed in *R. I. SS.*, iii, pt. ii, p. 440 f.

Modern Works.—Quite a number of good, more or less modern, biographies of Benedict XI. are available. P. T. Campana, O.P., *Vita B. Benedetto XI.*, Milan, 1736; A. Scotti, *Memorie del B. Benedetto XI.*, Treviso, 1737, with bibliography and index; in A. Touron's *Hist. des hommes illustres de l'ordre de S. Dominique*, Paris, 1741, there is a short biography of B. XI. We have used the Italian trans. of 1746, vol. iii, p. 351 ff. L. Fietta, *Niccolò Boccasino e il suo tempo*, 2 vols., Padua, 1871. The first vol. (not documented, but containing a bibliography and an index in the second vol.) treats of Benedict's life, the second of his writings. Léon Gautier, *Benoît XI.*, Tours, 1876, 3rd ed. (useful, but a little out of date); C. Grandjean, *Benoît XI. avant son pontificat*, Rome, 1888 (extrait des *Mélanges d'archéol. et d'hist.*, vol. viii), very good and full; P. Funke, *Papst Benedikt XI.*, Munster-i-W., 1891¹; F. Ferreton, *Vita di B. Benedetto XI.*, published at Treviso on the sixth centenary of his death (1904)—small but well done.

As bearing on Benedict's *life*, we may also cite G. Arias, "I banchieri toscani e la S. Sede sotto B. XI.," ap. *Archivio di storia patria*, vol. xxiv (1901); "*Recherches sur l'administration financière du B. XI.*" by C. Grandjean, ap. *Mélanges, etc.*, vol. iii, 1883, p. 47 ff.; and, by the same author, "Documents relatifs à la legation du cardinal de Prato en Toscane," ap. *ib.*, p. 379 ff., and "La date de la mort de Benoît XI.," ap. *ib.*, vol. xiv (1894), p. 241 ff. See also W. E. Lunt, "The account of a papal collector in England in 1304," ap. *Eng. Hist. Rev.*, vol. xxviii (1913), p. 313 ff.

CONTEMPORARY SOVEREIGNS.

(See under Boniface VIII.)

¹ There is also quoted *Benedikt XI.*, by Kindler, Posen, 1891, which I have not seen.

CHAPTER I.

EARLY CAREER ; ELECTION AND CORONATION.

IN an "itinerary" which the famous Marin Sanuto made through the "Venetian mainland" in 1483, he tells us that Treviso with its large adjoining territory (terra grossa) was the first place on the mainland to come under the power of Venice (1388), and that before that period it had belonged to the Emperor. On the fine palace of Raxon, he says, there was a great eagle which proved that the place once belonged to the Empire.¹ In this imperial city, then, Nicholas Boccasino, afterwards Pope Benedict XI., was born in the year 1240.² His father, Boccasio Boccasino, was a notary public, and had by his wife, Bernarda, a daughter, Adeletta, as well as Nicholas.³ As the notary died before his son was six years of age, the family was reduced to most straitened circumstances. But a chance was given to the little Nicholas by a benefactor who, in bequeathing fifty Venetian pounds to the family, willed that the boy was to have half the money if he entered the Dominican Order.⁴ Accordingly, when fourteen years of age (1254), he became a Dominican

Date and
place of
birth, etc.

¹ "Dove (the palace) è una gran aquila in demonstratione che fu terra de l'Imperio." *Itinerario di M. S.*, p. 118, ed. R. Brown, Padua, 1847.

² B. Guidonis, *in vit. B.*; his contemporary epitaph gives "Tarriginatus", ap. A. Lupattelli, *Benedetto XI. in Perugia*, p. 11, Rome, 1903. By mistake the Bollandists and Duchesne, *L.P.*, ii, p. 472, give "Trevisii natus". The date of his birth is given by a MS. of Perugia ap. Grandjean, *Benoît avant, etc.*, p. 221, note, and can be proved by other data. See Scoti, *Mem.*, p. 26 ff.

³ See a will of 1246, ap. Grandjean, *ib.*, p. 221, n. 4.

⁴ See the will, ap. Scoti, p. 218.

novice,¹ and soon after an inmate of the convent of SS. John and Paul at Venice,² so that he was certainly justified in saying when he became Pope that to the Order of St. Dominic, to which he was attached in his early youth, he owed everything he had in body, mind, and soul.³ Whilst at Venice he had charge of the education of the children of a Venetian nobleman, Rome Querini,⁴ and when he became Pope did not forget to bestow favours on a family which had, we may be sure, been kind to the bright young friar.⁵

In 1262 Nicholas was sent for a higher course of studies to Milan,⁶ where we are assured he made great progress.⁷ He then, in turn, after fourteen years' preparation (1254-68), became a teacher of his brethren; he became a *lector*, and taught for fourteen years (1268-82). The fourteen years after that (1282-96) were passed by Nicholas in various positions of authority in the Order.⁸ He then became its Master-General (1296), when, in 1298, he was made a cardinal by Boniface VIII. Whilst *lector* he taught besides at Milan, at least in his native Treviso and at Genoa, as we learn from wills leaving him money and religious habits.⁹

¹ B. G. *in vit.*, p. 672.

² See the authority quoted by Scoti, p. 46.

³ Praising the Order he added: "*cujus a juventute nostra fuimus voluntarii, cuius elementis fuimus temporibus multis tam in vita, quam in scientia et moribus educati.*" Ep. of March 12, 1304. "*Ex horto delitioso,*" ap. Scoti, p. 240 ff.

⁴ Villani, *Chron.*, viii, 66.

⁵ Cf. *Reg.*, nn. 224, 245, 294, for Bartholomew Querini, n. 1142 for James Querini, and n. 201 for an illegitimate son of Nicholas Q.

⁶ See the *Brevis Chronica* of Taeggio (fifteenth cent.) ap. Campana, p. 12.

⁷ B. Guidonis, *in vit.*

⁸ In 1296 he was elected General: "*qui quartodecimo anno etatis sue anno ad ordinem predicatorum venit, XIII annis studuit, XIII legit, XIII prefuit in prelatione.*" *Chronica Ordinis*, ed. Reichert, p. 18, Rome, 1904.

⁹ See the documents in Scoti, *Mem.*, pp. 226-8.

Between 1282 and 1286, he became subprior, prior, and provincial of Lombardy, and at length Master-General (1296).¹ As Provincial, Nicholas had to supervise and guide fifty-one convents of men, several of women, and a number of *loci*, or convents in process of formation. Of the twelve provinces of which the Dominican Order then consisted, that of Lombardy was the most flourishing,² and the care of it was intensified by the fact that its Provincial was head of the Inquisition throughout nearly the whole province. That Nicholas proved a successful administrator of his province would seem to be established by the fact that he exercised the office twice in ten years (1286-9 and 1292-6). In his capacity as Inquisitor, he made peace, at their request, between the people of Parma and his Order. It had been broken by the punishment of a heretic woman (Todesca), and the subsequent sacking of the Dominican convent in the city (1287).³ Nicholas Boccasino was essentially a man of peace, as his acts and the testimony of even such writers as Ferreti and Pipinus prove.⁴ If, however, his relations towards heretics and towards the weak and poor, where kindness and patience are so essential, make it clear that he was indeed a man of loving heart, his conduct in face of the Colonnas and Philip of France, where a courageous severity was called for, forces the verdict that in him fortitude was not on a level with prudence, and that his pontificate would have been more glorious had it been cast in more peaceful times.

As Provincial of Lombardy he took a prominent part in the General Chapters at Bordeaux (May, 1287), and

Provincial of Lombardy.

Nicholas defends the General of the Order.

¹ St. Antoninus, *Chron.*, tit. xx, c. 8, p. 263.

² Grandjean, *B. avant*, p. 235 f.

³ *Chron. Parmense*, an. 1287, ap. *R. I. SS.*, ix, pt. ix, p. 52 f. (new ed.).

⁴ To the first he appeared: "benignus et mitis, jurgia oderat, et pacem amabat." *Hist.*, p. 167; to the second "Caritativus fuit multum". *Chron.*, ap. *R. I. SS.*, ix, p. 747.

at Lucca (May, 1288). In the former he was one of those who defended the Master-General, Muñoz de Zamora, whose mosaic figure gives such interest to the floor of Sta. Sabina on the Aventine. He was accused, it appears, of incompetence, of being unable or unwilling to put an end to certain scandals in the Order. At any rate, the *Acts* of the Chapter of Bordeaux state that certain French Dominicans "sharpened their tongues to the detriment of the good name of the venerable father, the Master of the Order. They had spread abroad accusations about him which were groundless, and of which he was wholly innocent". The said brothers were ordered by the Chapter to be severely punished. Among other things they were to be reduced to bread and water for twelve days, and were to receive "the discipline".¹ Nicholas of Treviso, as Provincial, had with some others to see to the execution of the decisions of the Chapter.²

Somewhat later, he was called upon to defend the General against a much more powerful adversary than a few disaffected brethren. On February 21, 1290, Pope Nicholas IV. suspended the powers of Muñoz, and gave over the government of the Dominican Order to two cardinals of the Order, Latinus, bishop of Ostia and Velletri, and Hugh de Billom, of Sta. Sabina.³ A few days later, the two cardinals, in virtue of the power given them, addressed a letter to the Provincials of the Order who were about to meet in chapter at Ferrara, and declared Muñoz deposed "on account of certain matters which had been brought to their notice".⁴ Moreover,

¹ *Acta capit. gen. ordinis Prædic.*, i, p. 241, ed. Reichert, Rome, 1898.

² The part taken by Nicholas in this Chapter may be gathered from documents relating to the Dominican Order published by Martène, *Thesaurus*, iv. See p. 1845.

³ Mortier, *Hist. des M. G.*, ii, 252-3, gives the letter in full.

⁴ Ep. of Apr. 26, 1290, enclosed in another of May 1, 1290, to a number of Provincials who are named. Ap. Martène, *Thes.*, iv, 1841-2.

in evident anticipation of trouble on account of this high-handed proceeding, Pope Nicholas addressed a letter bidding the members of the General Chapter conduct their business without disturbances.¹

When the Chapter met and heard that a General whom all respected was, on mere reports, to be made to resign, its members showed their deep indignation in no uncertain manner. The cardinals were told that an appeal against their act had been lodged with the Pope, and they were urged not to try to introduce novelties which troubled men's minds.² A little later, after careful investigation had been made into the General's conduct, they were further informed that he was universally regarded as a model of what a friar and a General should be.³ How profound was the irritation of the Chapter at this attack on the liberties of their Order, is clear from the circular which they addressed to all its members notifying them of the appeal they were making to the Holy See against the action of the two cardinals who, they said, professed to rely "on a certain commission given them by the Holy Father the lord Pope, Nicholas IV." ⁴

The next step in the attack on the General was to summon him to Rome. But, not even by the offer of the archbishopric of Compostella, could Muñoz be induced to resign his position. He was, accordingly, treated by the Pope himself in the same unsatisfactory way in which he had been treated by his legates. Without assigning any just cause, but seeing that "certain reasons had arisen" why it was inexpedient that he should continue to govern the Order, he was deposed (Apr. 12, 1291).⁵

¹ Ep. of May 6, 1290, ap. *ib.*, p. 1839.

² Ep. to the cards., *ib.*, p. 1842.

³ Ap. *ib.*, p. 1843.

⁴ Ap. *ib.*, p. 1845 ff., May 27, 1290.

⁵ The bull of deposition is given in full by Mortier, *l.c.*, p. 269, n. Cf. Potthast, 23643. It was reissued Aug. 13, 1291, also given in full by Mortier, p. 271 f., n.

In connection with this unpleasant affair, we have only to note that our Nicholas of Treviso seemingly supported Muñoz throughout,¹ and that the causes of the harsh, not to say unjust, treatment meted out to the General by Pope Nicholas remain more or less obscure. The Dominican author (Mortier) of the story of the Masters-General of his Order does not think that the action of Nicholas against Muñoz was due to any jealous ill-feeling against the Order on the part of a Franciscan Pope.² He points out that, during the whole of his pontificate, Nicholas bestowed favours on the Order. His attitude towards Muñoz was personal.³ Mortier suggests that his Spanish nationality may have been a predisposing cause to the Pope's hostility. Spanish sovereigns had at this period given a good deal of trouble to the Holy See and also to France over Sicily; and it was in France that accusations against Muñoz had taken their rise. However that may be, the real reason of the Pope's action against Muñoz would appear to have been a rule made by him (1285) in connection with the *Ordo de Pœnitentia*, the Third Order—the Order of men and women living in the world—instituted by St. Francis. The new rule proved attractive to many souls, and so tended to draw these lay fraternities “of penance” under Dominican influence. This was much resented by the Minorite, Jerome of Ascoli. Accordingly, after he became Pope Nicholas IV., he published two bulls to reaffirm Franciscan influence over the *Ordo de Pœnitentia*.⁴ It

¹ Martène, iv, pp. 1845, 1847. Cf. Grandjean, p. 246.

² Such is the idea of Grandjean, p. 241.

³ *L.c.*, p. 280.

⁴ The first (“*Supra montem catholicæ*”) is dated Aug. 17, 1289, and may be read in *Bullar. Rom.*, iv, p. 90 ff., or Eubel, *Bullar. Francisc. Epit.*, p. 302 ff. The second (Aug. 10, 1290) is given in full by Mortier, *l.c.*, p. 288, n.

is not then perhaps so difficult to understand why Nicholas believed the accusations that were brought against Muñoz, and found that the aggressive Spaniard was an unfit person to govern the Friars Preachers. On the other hand, it may have been that he was convinced that it was necessary to punish the General for allowing some of his subjects to encourage disobedience to the local ordinaries by admitting persons to communion who had been excommunicated by them.¹ Still, if that were the reason, it should have been openly stated, so that Muñoz might have had an opportunity of defence.

But little is known of the work of Nicholas during the period time when, for the second time, he was provincial of Lombardy. He had held the post, however, about four years when, on the death of Stephen of Besançon, he was elected at Strasburg Master-General of the Order (May, 1296).² For two years and a half he governed the Order, we are assured, in peace, justice, and lowliness of spirit, showing himself lovingly devoted to the interests of the community.³ He was wont to exhort the brethren ever to devote themselves to the study of the Sacred Scriptures, and to prayer, to be very respectful to the authorities in the Church, and to be very cautious in their intercourse with women "whose wheedling words undo the very manliest souls".⁴

In our biography of Boniface VIII., we called attention to the fact that the General Chapter of the Order over which Nicholas presided at Venice (1297) strictly forbade any of the Friars to take any action whatever in behalf

¹ See the letter of May 6, 1290, which he sent to the Chapter at Ferrara, ap. Mart., *l.c.*, iv, 1839.

² B. Guidonis, *De ordine Prædic.*, ap. R. F. S., xxi, p. 737.

³ *Ib.*

⁴ See his instruction to the brethren, ap. Martène, *l.c.*, pp. 1865-6. Cf. a second, *ib.*, p. 1871 f.

of those who were in opposition to that Pontiff, but ordered that they should everywhere proclaim that he was "the true Pope, the successor of St. Peter, and the Vicar of Jesus Christ".¹ Likewise, in his charge to all the brethren, Nicholas wrote: "Especially give honour to our most holy Father and lord, Boniface, by Divine Providence supreme Pontiff. Honour him as the true vicar of Christ on earth, and the lawful successor of Blessed Peter the Prince of the Apostles, and loathe as vain words and sacrilege anything put forth in any way against his dignity or condition."²

The abbot of Trudo who "had no Latin".

The historian of the abbots of Trudo says that when Nicholas was Master-General of the Order, or, at any rate, when he was provincial, he was invited to dine by the abbot of the time. As the abbot's Latin was very weak, it was suggested to Nicholas that he should talk to him in French. However, if the Abbot could not speak Latin, he could give a good dinner, and Nicholas carried away a very pleasant recollection of Trudo and its worthy abbot.

When he became Pope, he heard that some monks from Trudo had arrived in Rome on some very important business for their abbot. As soon as he learnt that there was question "of the abbot without Latin", he ordered his business to be settled for him without delay.³

Nicholas a papal nuncio.

Towards the close of this same year (1297), Nicholas was initiated into the great game of politics by being sent, along with John de Murro, the General of the Franciscans, by Pope Boniface to Flanders, to promote the cause of peace between England and France.⁴ This

¹ C. 6, ap. *ib.*, pp. 1866-7.

² Ap. *ib.*, p. 1868 f. Cf. similar language of one of his successors, Bernard de Jusix in 1301, ap. *ib.*, pp. 1882-3.

³ *Gest. abb. Trud.*, ap. *M. G. SS.*, x, p. 411.

⁴ N. Trivet, *Chron.*, p. 369; and *supra*, p. 273.

diplomatic mission was soon over, and Nicholas returned to his regular work as Master-General.

But, towards the close of the following year, rumours reached him that he had been made a cardinal. They proved to be correct, and he received the papal bull announcing his appointment (Dec. 5, 1298), when he was at Lézignan, on his way to Narbonne, Jan., 1299.¹ Proclaiming that, in nominating him to the cardinalate, he wished to honour both the Dominican Order and its virtuous head, Boniface directed him to come to him as soon as possible. Nicholas thus became cardinal-priest of Sta. Sabina, and afterwards cardinal-bishop of Ostia.² Leaving Lézignan, Nicholas entered Narbonne on the following day (Jan. 15), and after the papal bull had been read in the chapter-house of the Friars before the canons of the cathedral and the people, he resigned his office of Master, and ordered his seal to be broken in the sight of all.³

A cardinal,
1298.

On his journey to the Pope, Nicholas passed through Milan, where he had been educated. He received an honourable reception from the imperial vicar, Matteo Visconti, "under whose dominion" the city then was,⁴ and when he became Pope did not forget the city of his

His journey
to Boniface,
and work as
cardinal.

¹ Ap. Mart., iv, p. 1873. The frequent mistakes in pagination at this part of the vol. should be noticed.

² B. Guidonis, *De ord. prædic.*, p. 737. For the others who were made cardinals at the same time, cf. *ib.*, *Chron.*, p. 712.

³ See extracts from B. Guidonis, ap. Martène, *ib.*, pp. 1873-4. Raymond, the provincial prior of Provence, in telling his brethren of these events, speaks of the great virtues of Nicholas, both as a subject and as a ruler: "Cujus religio laudabilis, conversatio dulcis et humilis, et prælatio perutilis erat." Ep. ap. Quétif and Echard, *Script. Ord. Prædicatorum*, i, 446, ap. Gautier, p. 107.

⁴ Galvaneus Flamma, *Manip. Florum*, cc. 333 and 336, ap. R. I. SS., xi, p. 715 f. "Quod papa effectus bene recognovit." Cf. Miss D. Muir, *A Hist. of Milan under the Visconti*, pp. 8-10.

youth, and the family which had treated him with distinction.¹

When he arrived at the pontifical court, he was soon given plenty of work to do; and so we see him, for instance, with a cardinal who had been a Franciscan, making regulations as to the distance there had to be between buildings belonging to their respective Orders.² We see him, also, engaged in trying heretics,³ in managing to its satisfaction the affairs of Venice,⁴ and, for a brief period, those of the Dominican Order.⁵ But his most important work as cardinal was his legation to Hungary to which he was appointed on May 31, 1301,⁶ and which occupied him two years. In the bull by which he conferred the appointment upon him, Boniface spoke of him in the most laudatory manner,⁷ and sent him to establish Carobert of Anjou, grandson of Charles II. of Naples, on the throne of Hungary,⁸ and to occupy himself with the interests of the Church in that country, and with the conversion of the infidel in its neighbourhood.

Andrew III., the rival of Carobert, died without a male

Mission in
Hungary,
1301.

¹ "Nicolaus Trapisinus . . . papa efficitur qui civitatem mediolani dilexit." *Annal. Mediol.*, c. 76, ap. *R. I. SS.*, xvi, p. 689.

² Decree of July 18, 1300, ap. *Reg.*, n. 1163 (Dec. 5, 1303), where, as Pope, Benedict XI. confirmed the decisions he had made as cardinal.

³ See the long drawn out case of Armano Punzilupo of Ferrara whose memory was ultimately condemned by Boniface VIII., Dec. 20, 1300. See his bull in *Dissert.* 60 of Muratori, *Antiq.*, v, p. 141 ff. From it we see that Boniface: "wishing to have more exact information on the matter" commissioned card. Nicholas among others to examine the affair. He had become bp. of Ostia on March 2, 1300.

⁴ Document ap. Grandjean, p. 267, n.

⁵ Cf. *Reg. Bonif. VIII.*, n. 3692, Sept. 23, 1300.

⁶ Theiner, *Mon. Hung.*, i, p. 385, n. 619; and *Reg. Bonif. VIII.*, 4338-74.

⁷ *Ib.* "Personam tuam altissimus gratiarum dominus scientiarum magnitudine, providentie munere, circumspectionis gratia, industrie claritate, multisque virtutibus insignivit."

⁸ Cf. *supra*, p. 108.

heir¹ towards the beginning of the year 1301, but when Carobert arrived on the frontiers of Hungary, he found that, at the request of most of the clerical and lay magnates of the country its crown had been offered to the young son of King Wenceslaus IV. of Bohemia. He was, it is true, only twelve years of age, but, like Carobert himself, was descended from Bela IV. of Hungary, and was the son of a powerful prince. Accordingly, without delay Carobert had himself crowned at Gran by its archbishop-elect, Gregory of Katupani,² while a little later, in August, the young Wenceslaus, called Ladislaus by the Hungarians, was crowned by John, archbishop of Kalocsa, at Stuhlweissenburg.³

Carobert had a difficult task. His opponents posed as the independent party. They were anxious, they proclaimed, "not to lose the liberty of a free kingdom by accepting a King given by the Church."⁴ They had, too, the power of Bohemia behind them—a power which Pope Boniface had hoped to secure for Carobert.⁵ The Church, however, proved a sufficiently powerful ally for the Angevin. However, at first, when Boniface heard from the envoys of Wenceslaus not that their King was supporting his candidate, but that, with no small pretence of right, he had put up his son against him, he felt bound

¹ Grandjean is mistaken in supposing that Carobert subsequently married Andrew's only daughter, Adelaide. His only daughter, Elizabeth, became a nun. Cf. Cipolla's note regarding the three wives of Carobert to Ferreti, *Hist.*, i, p. 169.

² Boniface distinctly states that Carobert was crowned before Wenceslaus: "Carolus . . . per Strigoniensem (Gran) electum . . . in ejusdem Regni Ungarie Regem fuisset *antea* coronatus." Ep. to Nicholas of Oct. 17, 1301, ap. Theiner, *Mon. H.*, i, p. 388. When he says in other letters (*ib.*, pp. 397, 417) that Carobert was crowned "per personam idoneam", he surely means by Gregory, and not "per proxy" as Grandjean supposes?

³ Cf. Thuroczy, *Chron. Hung.*, c. 84.

⁴ *Ib.*

⁵ See his letter to W., May 13, 1301, ap. Potthast, n. 25046.

to listen to what he had to say in his son's behalf. Accordingly, while expressing his goodwill towards the King, he explained to him that, as "at least in doubtful and more important matters" recourse ought to be had to the Apostolic See, the King ought to have put the claims of his son before it, and not to have had him at once crowned by one who had no right to crown the Kings of Hungary. Seeing how the noble kingdom of Hungary had been almost destroyed by the Tartars and other pagans, he was, he added, the more distressed at the action of archbishop John. He, therefore, exhorted the King to hearken to the words of the Legate, "a great member of the Roman Church," whom he had sent to Hungary; and he assured him that he would give due weight to his claims if they were put properly before him.¹ He did not, however, deal so gently with the forward archbishop of Kalocsa. For his presumption, the legate was ordered to summon him to appear before the Pope within four months, so that he might defend or explain away his conduct if he could.²

The archbishop, indeed, saved himself from the Pope's anger by dying in the interim. On the news of his death, Boniface reserved to himself the appointment of his successor, and instructed his legate to make inquiries about a suitable successor.³ Nicholas who had, meanwhile, made his headquarters at Buda,⁴ and had had a

¹ Ep. of Oct. 17, 1301, ap. Theiner, *Mon. H.*, i, p. 387 f., n. 621. Cf. nn. 623, 626.

² Ep. of same date, ap. *ib.*, pp. 388-9. In this letter Boniface puts forth just the same doctrine out of which Philip le Bel afterwards concocted such trouble. "Romanus Pontifex super Reges et Regna constitutus a Deo, in ecclesia militante Gerarcha summus existit, et super omnes mortales optinens principatum (an unfortunate word), sedensque in solio iudicii, etc.

³ Epp. of Boniface of Nov. 8, 1301, ap. *ib.*, p. 390 ff., n. 625; cf. 626.

⁴ Not at "Ruga", as the name appears in Theiner, *l.c.*, ep. 626, p. 391. The account of these events in Ferreti, i, 168 f., is not exact.

conference with the bishops of Hungary, had to report to the Pope that he could not bring the rivals "either to concord or to compromise".¹ Boniface, accordingly, instructed him to summon the King of Bohemia and his son to lay their case before him within six months.²

Before these instructions reached Nicholas, the increasing power of the followers of the young Bohemian had forced him to fly to Vienna, and Carobert to the borders of Hungary.³ However, he promptly issued the citations, while the papal officials issued corresponding ones to Mary, Queen of Sicily, the mother of Carobert, through whom he derived his title. By the appointed time, duly accredited agents from the Queen and Carobert presented themselves before the Pope and the cardinals, supported by a number of Hungarian bishops and prelates. From the Bohemian King and his son, on the other hand, certain envoys came merely to make excuses; and, when pressed, bluntly declared that their master had no intention whatever of submitting his claims to Hungary to the decision of any court of law.⁴

The Pope accordingly went into the merits of the case on the evidence before him, and decided that, as the crown of Hungary descended not to an elected candidate, but to the next of kin, it belonged to Mary, and so to her son, as their claim of kinship was better than that of Wenceslaus and his son.⁵ However, as it became the dignity of the Apostolic See to proceed with care, four more months were to be allowed the King of Bohemia during which he might appeal against the papal decision.⁶

Flight of
Nicholas.

Decision of
Boniface.

¹ Ep. 628 of June 10, 1302, ap. *ib.*, pp. 392-3.

² Ep. 629 of the same date.

³ Cf. *Chron. Zwettlensis contin.*, p. 660, ap. *M. G. SS.*, t. ix. Cf. *Contin. Sancrucensis*, and *Vindobonensis*, ap. *ib.*, ad ann., pp. 732 and 722. The legate was at Presburg on May 21, 1302. Cf. *Codex diplom. maj. polon.*, ii, p. 208.

⁴ Ep. 635 of May 31, 1303, ap. *T.*, p. 397 ff.

⁵ *Ib.*

⁶ *Ib.*

The Queen and her son were duly notified of the sentence, and the latter was paternally exhorted to govern the kingdom well so that it might recover from its pitiable state of exhaustion.¹ Certain bishops were commanded to publish the award throughout Hungary,² Albert, King of the Romans, and the duke of Austria were asked to help Carobert, and all the nobles of Hungary, ecclesiastical and lay, were ordered to obey him as their lawful sovereign.³

Final
acknow-
ledgment of
Carobert,
1310.

Unfortunately, this decision did not put an end to the strife in Hungary. After the death of Boniface, the Bohemians handed over their claims to Otho III., duke of Bavaria, another descendant of Bela IV. of Hungary; and it was not till 1310 that, through the work of cardinal Gentile, Carobert was finally acknowledged as the undisputed King of Hungary.⁴

Nicholas
returns to
the Pope,
1303.

From inscriptions cited by Grandjean, it appears that Nicholas, recalled in 1303,⁵ passed through his native Treviso about April, through Padua in May,⁶ and reached Anagni before May 22.⁷ In his mission he had, as Boniface said of him, endured much anxiety, and much bodily toil and sufferings, which, if not rewarded by the peace he had worked for, were "meritorious and glorious in the eyes of God".⁸ He had, too, returned in time to stand faithfully by his master's side when so many

¹ Epp. 336 and 337 of June 3, 1303.

² Ep. 338 of June 11. Cf. epp. 641-5, declarations of bishops and cathedral chapters that the award had been duly published.

³ Epp. of June 11, 1303, nn. 339 and 340, all ap. T.

⁴ Cf. Thuroczy, *Chron. Hung.*, cc. 86-9; *Reg. Clement V.*, nn. 1797, 2274 ff.

⁵ *Contin. Zwetlen.*, p. 660.

⁶ *Reg. Bened.*, Feb. 14, 1304, n. 647.

⁷ See a decision issued by him as cardinal on that day, ap. *ib.*, p. 155 ff.

⁸ See these appreciative words of the Pope in his letter to Wenceslaus of Bohemia, ep. 628, ap. Theiner, *l.c.*

others abandoned him in the hour of his need.¹ He does not appear to have been in the Pope's palace when the attack on the city was made, and consequently he was not with Boniface when his ruffianly assailants burst in upon him. But, as he tells us himself, he was an eyewitness of much that took place on that dreadful occasion.

Boniface VIII., as we have seen, died on October II. The cardinals, accordingly, who were in Rome, having waited the prescribed ten days,² met together and proceeded to elect a new Pope. To quote the words of Benedict himself in proclaiming his election to King Edward, the archbishop of Milan, etc. : The cardinals, he said, assembled "in the Palace of St. Peter *de Urbe*, where our predecessor had died. Having decided to carry out the election by the method of scrutiny, it happened, by the will of Him who loves concord, that at the very first there was found to be such a number of votes in our favour, that, though undeserving, we were elected to the office of the Apostleship on the eleventh day before the Kalends of the coming November," i.e., as the Pope wrote on October 31, the twenty-second of that month.³ The cardinals had been too horrified by the

The election
of Nicholas,
1303.

¹ "Cardinales vero sibi timentes, relicto eo (Pope Boniface) fugerunt, duobus exceptis, scilicet d. Petro Hispano Sabinensi, et d. Nicolao Ostiensi episcopis." B. Guidonis, *Chron.*, ap. *R. F. S.*, xxi, pp. 713-14. Cf. the words of Benedict XI. himself. Ep. "Flagitiosum Scelus", *Reg.*, n. 1276, and the accusations of Nogaret, ap. Dupuy, p. 312, n. 38 ; 313, n. 41, where Nogaret does not deny that Nicholas saw the deeds that he had done, but he says that he did not see their justification!

² *Vita B.*, of B. Guidonis, p. 672; Ptol. of Lucca, *H.E.*, ap. *R. I. SS.*, xi, 1224, etc. By the decree of the Council of Lyons (*Sext. decret.*, lib. i, tit. vi, c. 3, the cardinals in the city where the Pope died : "absentes exspectare decem diebus tantummodo teneantur." See the Colonna critic who pretended that the election of Benedict was illegal as the ten days were not awaited, and the true cardinals (the Colonnas !) were not summoned, etc. Ap. Finke, *Mon. Ar.*, i, p. 153 f. A letter ap. *Reg. Clement V.*, n. 1151, also shows that the ten days interval was observed.

³ *Reg.*, n. 1.

sacrilege of Anagni to think of party. It would appear that all they had thought of was to choose a man who would make peace with France, when, perhaps for the ultimate good of Christendom, it might have been better if they had elected one who would have waged determined war with it.

However that may be, in the encyclical in which he notified his election to the world, and from which we have just quoted a passage, the new Pope told how it had been his original wish when he joined the Order of the Preachers to serve God under the yoke of obedience. But he had been called by his Creator to one position of authority after another, till he had finally been chosen to fill the chair of Peter. Despite his opposition, his brethren had insisted on his mounting it. He had, accordingly, after the manner of his predecessors, received the solemn benediction,¹ so that it only remained for him to implore earnest prayers to enable him to do God's work well.

The solemn blessing to which the Pope referred was accompanied by his coronation which, in the presence of King Charles and two of his sons, took place on Sunday, Oct. 27, five days after his election.² Almost immediately after his coronation, Benedict took up his abode at the Lateran, still the official residence of the Popes. There he remained most of the time that he stayed in Rome.

He took as his motto: "Make thy face shine upon thy servant" (Ps. xxx, 17), and his name "Benedict", so it is said in honour of his predecessor, Benedict Gaetani.

¹ Being already a bishop, he was not consecrated. "Recepimus consequenter, solemnna benedictionis et cetera, secundum morem preficiendorum Romanorum pontificum." *Ib.*

² B. Guidonis, *l.c.*, Ferreti, i, 170, who pretends (p. 169) that Charles had worked hard to secure the election of Nicholas because he had so stoutly supported the claims of his grandson to the throne of Hungary.

CHAPTER II.

PHILIP OF FRANCE AND THE SACRILEGE OF ANAGNI.

ONE reason, perhaps, why the cardinals made their choice of a Pope so quickly was that they did not wish to have their hands forced by France. Even if we need not attach much weight to a statement made by a Flemish chronicle that it was "the ambassadors of the King of France who put the cardinals in conclave",¹ we cannot doubt that they were fully alive to the fact that Nogaret was still in the Campagna, trying to raise a fresh force, and that Rome was in the hands of Charles II. From the Paduan version of the *History* of Ptolemy of Lucca, we learn that the King entered the city with fifteen hundred horse and eight thousand foot on the day of Pope Boniface's death. We are further told that he came "for the good of the Church—*ad favendum Ecclesiæ*", and that it was in answer to his petition that the cardinals went into conclave.² How far in the mind of Charles the interests of the Church were those of Charles himself may be matter for shrewd conjecture. But, at any rate, his presence kept the city quiet, and two fresh senators, Gentile Orsini and Luca Savelli,³ took the place of Napoleon Orsini and Alexius Bonaventura, who had resigned at the outbreak of the trouble after the seizure of Boniface.

Charles II. in Rome, 1303.

¹ After the death of Boniface : "les ambaxadeurs du roy de France fisrent les cardinaulx mettre en conclave." *Anciennes chroniques de Flandre*, ap. *R. F. S.*, xxii, 374.

² Ap. *R. I. SS.*, xi, p. 1224. Cf. Ferreti, *Hist.*, i, p. 166, who says that the galleys of Frederick of Sicily appeared at the same time at Ostia.

³ Cf. authorities, ap. Vitale, *Senatori*, i, 207, and *Reg.*, n. 1236, of March 14, 1304.

Whilst King Charles remained in Rome,¹ he did not neglect his own affairs. He not only secured a prolongation of the time during which he was bound to repay a debt he owed to the Holy See,² but, when he renewed his oath of allegiance, he protested that he was not bound to pay another debt which amounted to fifty thousand marks sterling. He declared that Pope Boniface had remitted the debt. Despite his difficulties, Benedict was not prepared to give way to all the King's demands, and so declared that he could accept his protest only within the limits of truth and justice.³

Frederick of
Sicily,
1303-4.

In the same way, too, Benedict had to oblige his other vassal, Frederick, who had also sent assistance to his predecessor and the Holy See. He had to grant him also an extension of time for the payment of the tribute due from the isle of Sicily.⁴ Even at the expiration of the extended period, the full "three thousand ounces of gold of the general Sicilian standard" which had been due on June 29, 1303, was not forthcoming. However, on June 17, 1304, the Pope acknowledges the receipt of ten thousand florins as the equivalent of two thousand ounces of gold, but takes good care to remind Frederick that he still owes a thousand ounces (even of one year's tribute) and that the receipt he is sending him is merely the acknowledgment of his payment on account, and not an acquittance in full.⁵ According to the Aragonese nuncios at the Papal Curia, Frederick's envoys met with a very cold reception when it was found that they had only brought a third of the whole sum due, and that when they expressed their master's love and devotion to the

¹ He was not back in Naples till Dec. 4, and his son Robert was acting there as his Vicar till Dec. 3. Cf. *Syllabus Membran.*, ii, pt. ii, p. 97.

² *Reg.*, n. 1111, Oct. 31, 1303.

³ *Ib.*, n. 1280, Nov. 5, 1303.

⁴ *Reg.*, n. 1122, Dec. 2, 1303.

⁵ *Reg.*, 1279, June 17, 1304.

Holy See, the Pope replied that he would be glad if he showed it in deeds.¹

In other directions also, Frederick endeavoured to take advantage of the Pope's difficulties to free himself from the restrictions of the treaty of Caltabellota. Accordingly, in writing to Benedict, instead of signing himself King of "Trinacria" and speaking of the first year of his reign, he showed his aims and ambitions, by speaking of the eighth year of his reign as King "of Sicily". Against this assumption the Pope, in the interests of justice, protested.² Benedict's protest was at least so far listened to that, when Conrad Doria, Frederick's admiral, took the oath of allegiance to him in his master's name, he simply styled himself "the procurator and envoy" of the illustrious King Frederick.³

Before the completion of these more or less satisfactory arrangements with the two most important vassals of the Church, Benedict commenced to take proceedings against the perpetrators of the sacrilege of Anagni. On November 6, he published an encyclical "to all the faithful of Christ". He set forth how recently "certain sons of iniquity, the first-born of Satan, children of perdition", had recently been guilty of the greatest possible crime in laying violent hands in Anagni upon our predecessor, Pope Boniface, and, moreover, in plundering the treasury of the Church and property belonging to the Pope himself and others. During that same hour of the power of darkness, cardinals were robbed both in the city and in the Campagna, and now many who have received the stolen goods, "impudently" refuse to restore

The perpetrators of the Anagni sacrilege denounced, 1303.

¹ Finke, *Mon. Arag.*, n. 113, p. 163.

² *Reg.*, n. 1112, Nov. 30, 1303. Cf. *ib.*, n. 1136, Jan. 6, 1304, in which he urges the King to act straightforwardly, so that "tecum via simplici ambulamus".

³ *Reg.*, n. 1239, Dec. 8, 1303.

them on the ground that they had lost their own. Within eight days after receiving this notice, all who had any of the stolen property must restore it, and such as knew where it was must give information about it to the proper authorities under pain of excommunication. Finally he ordered the greatest publicity to be given to his decree¹; and, a little later (Dec. 7), he commissioned his chaplain, Bernardus Roiardi, archdeacon of Saintes, a Frenchman (?), to devote himself to the recovery of the lost property.²

Boniface's
reservations
are recalled,
1303.

Another decree, issued on the same day, enables us to see under what influence the preceding wretched decree was penned. To insure his having real supporters in the French hierarchy against Philip, Boniface had reserved to himself provisions to all cathedral churches.³ Benedict, however, on the ground that various scandals might arise, and because "prelates and churches throughout the world thought themselves greatly aggrieved in this matter", revoked absolutely all the provisions and reservations of any kind which had been made by his predecessor, Boniface VIII., "of happy memory."⁴

When one thinks of the outrages that Benedict had seen inflicted on his benefactor, it seems incredible that his first proceedings should have been taken against those who had stolen money. Fear of France had evidently unmanned him.

Benedict's
helpless
position.

No doubt his position was desperate. He had no family influence to rely upon, no nephews whom he could trust to carry out his wishes.⁵ Some of the cardinals

¹ *Reg.*, n. 1099, Nov. 6, 1303. Cf. nn. 1100 and 1102, Nov. 18.

² *Reg.*, nn. 1119-20.

³ *Reg. Bonif. VIII.*, n. 5387.

⁴ *Reg.*, n. 1103, Nov. 6, 1303; cf. nn. 208, 1113.

⁵ "Non enim agnatos cognatosve ex humili natus progenie ad se accersendos habebat, non nepotes ullos quorum fiducia, metu securus auderet." Ferreti, i, p. 172.

were French in sympathy, and others were merely seeking advantages for their families. On the death of Pope Boniface, the Colonnas came out of their hiding places, and, according to an English chronicler,¹ sought for mercy, but it was with arms in their hands.² In general, the nobles of Rome, surrounded with gangs of armed retainers, defied the Pope and the laws of God and man. There were, indeed, some whom, with his Ghibelline sympathies, Ferreti calls "partisans of iniquity", who had the courage to urge Benedict to anathematize Philip of France, the publicly known author of the outrage on Boniface. But, according to this same historian, though sincerely desirous of being just, "he dare not manfully execute justice on the powerful."³

He continued his policy of concession to the unrepentant wrongdoer. Knowing that several cardinals were in their favour,⁴ he granted, on December 23, wholesale pardons to the Colonnas. For the moment, indeed, he did not restore their cardinalitial rank to James and Peter Colonna,⁵ nor their ecclesiastical privileges or property to the Colonnas generally. But, "taking compassion on their needs and miseries," he revoked all the other sentences and disabilities under which they, including even the brutal Sciarra, or their followers and supporters had been placed by Boniface. Finally, by

Pardon for
the
Colonnas.

¹ Rishanger, p. 221, *R. S.*

² Ferreti, *ib.*, p. 171. "Columnenses . . . armis se tuentes, claves sacras contempnere ausi sunt."

³ *Ib.* "Nec odio vel timore correptus in quemquam nisi juste ferebatur; sed non ideo justiciam in crassantium capita ausus est sequi viriliter."

⁴ According to Christian Spinula, a nuncio of James of Aragon, six cardinals, headed by Napoleon Orsini, were in favour of the Colonnas. Finke, *Mon. Arag.*, n. 105.

⁵ An Aragonese envoy averred that he could not have done that so quickly without scandal. *Mon. Ar.*, i, p. 161.

stating that "without his special permission", Palestrina was not to be rebuilt and fortified nor to recover its status as a bishopric, he evidently gave the Colonnas to understand that the time was not far distant when all the sentences passed against them would be removed.¹

Undoes work
of Boniface.

A week or two later, he suspended a number of constitutions regarding the March of Ancona that Boniface had issued without the advice of the cardinals. He regarded them as severe, and professed his intention of amending them.² Then, in the interests of the Dominicans and the Franciscans, he revoked the decree of Boniface "Super cathedram" which regulated the relations between the mendicants and the parochial clergy. The constitution of Boniface had, he averred, resulted in more harm than good. He, therefore, issued new regulations on the subject and granted the friars a variety of privileges, as, for instance, the right to preach to the people in their own establishments or in public places without the necessity of having to apply to the Ordinary for permission. In the same way they were to have the right of hearing confessions, and of burying in their grounds such as had expressed a wish to be there interred.³

Then followed a modification of Boniface's famous "Clericis laicos". Benedict restricted the penalties imposed by that bull on those who infringed its regulations to such as exacted taxes from the clergy, not to such as paid them or to such as received gifts that were offered freely. He, however, at the same time reminded the

¹ *Reg.*, n. 1135. Cf. Rishanger, *Chron.*, p. 221, R. S., and Dino Compagni, *Chron.*, iii, c. 1.

² *Ib.*, n. 1147, Jan. 14, 1304; also ap. Theiner, *Diplom.*, i, n. 577; cf. n. 578, where (Feb. 1, 1304) again as though brave where danger was not great, he withdrew various privileges which Boniface had granted to different cities in the Duchy of Spoleto. It is true they had all been granted "during the good pleasure of the Apostolic See".

³ *Reg.*, n. 1170. "Inter cunctas sollicitudines," Feb. 17, 1304.

clergy that such taxes had only to be paid in cases of necessity or of the common good when the contributions of the laity were not sufficient, and after consultation with the Holy See.¹

Whether, as Raynaldus suggests,² Benedict did all this moved "by a sense of justice or by zeal for the honour of God", he was at least in a hurry to undo the work of Boniface VIII.³

Animated by whatever motive, Benedict was to do yet more in the way of undoing the work of Boniface, and in the way of absolving unrepentant sinners. The Continuator of William of Nangis distinctly states that "without being asked", Benedict absolved Philip of France and his wife and sons from any sentence of excommunication which they might have incurred.⁴ Nor is there any reason to doubt the accuracy of the assertion, for in notifying Philip of the absolution, the Pope makes no mention of any kind of request that he had received from the King on the matter. In absolving him, he declared that it was his duty not to permit those who were outside the barque of Peter to remain there, and, on the other hand, to keep those there, even against their will, who were inside it. Outside this barque there is no salvation; and, as many say that you and yours are under sentence of excommunication, we absolve you from it. With its leaden bulla attached by red and yellow

Absolution
of Philip of
France,
1304.

¹ *Ib.*, n. 1269, May 12, 1304. On the same day he absolved the Genoese for helping Frederick, now the King of Trinacria. *Ib.*, nn. 818-20.

² *Annal.*, 1304, n. 12.

³ Geoffrey of Paris, *Chron.*, ap. *R. F. SS.*, xxii, p. 110, v. 2216 f., speaks of Benedict:—

" Qui la querèle
Acorda, et ce rapela
Que Boniface ot fet de là."

⁴ *Contin. Chron.*, i, p. 342.

silk bands, this bull is still preserved in the National Archives of France.¹ About a week later he sent the King a close letter in which he urged him to receive, "devoutly as a son of obedience," the absolution which he had granted him in the presence of his envoys, and without his asking for it,² and he exhorted him to turn in honourable obedience to his mother the Church. The envoys, who had arrived in Rome about the beginning of April, included the baron of Mercœur, Belleperche, Plaisan, whom an Aragonese nuncio describes as a cavalier learned in law, and even Nogaret,³ with regard to whom it can only be said that the insolence of Philip in attaching him to the embassy was only equalled by the feebleness of Benedict in accepting him.

Despite the fact that, at this very time, he had to beg Philip to restore the temporalities of his see to the new bishop of Châlon,⁴ Benedict not only continued to cancel the decrees by which Boniface had suspended the French doctors from teaching,⁵ and had reserved to himself provision of cathedrals and churches belonging to regulars,⁶ but proceeded to restore to him and his Queen the various privileges, such as the removal of La Sainte Chapelle from local episcopal control, which were wont to be granted to the royal house of France, but which Boniface had withdrawn.⁷ As will be seen directly, these

¹ *Reg.*, n. 1311, March 25, 1304.

² He speaks of the absolution "quam tibi nuper absenti et non petenti . . . in tuorum nunciorum presentia . . . prevenientes impendimus." *Ib.*, n. 1312, Apr. 2, 1304.

³ *Mon. Arag.*, nn. 111, 112.

⁴ *Reg.*, n. 694, Apr. 6, 1304.

⁵ *Ib.*, n. 1255, Apr. 18, 1304.

⁶ *Ib.*, n. 1256, Apr. 18.

⁷ *Ib.*, nn. 1251-2, 1264-7, Apr. 18-22, 1304. Cf. A. Tardif, *Privilèges accordés à la couronne de France*, nn. 121-2. It would seem that just because Boniface had forbidden the flesh of dead bodies to be boiled away so that the bones could be more easily transported, Philip had asked for the prohibition to be removed for him and his. N. 122, therefore, removed the prohibition. Apr. 18, 1301.

favours were, within a month, to be followed by others much more detrimental to the memory of his great predecessor.

Meanwhile, in Rome, after the departure of King Charles, the feuds between the principal families were rendering residence there impossible for the Pope. He might possibly have strengthened his position by creating a number of powerful cardinals. He contented himself with making two, both Dominicans (Dec. 18, 1303). One was Nicholas Alberti de Prato, bishop of Spoleto, who became bishop of Ostia, the other was an Englishman, Dr. William of Macclesfield, of the diocese of Lichfield, who was made cardinal-priest of Sta. Sabina. The latter, however, died before he heard the news of his creation¹ and was replaced (Feb. 19, 1304) by another Englishman and Dominican, Walter of Wynterburne, of the diocese of Salisbury, and confessor of King Edward. Benedict would certainly have strengthened his hand had he, for instance, made an influential Aragonese cardinal. We know that King James was most anxious to have a cardinal of his nation,² but, as one of his envoys bitterly exclaimed: "The Pope hardly ever opens his mouth except to a Dominican or a Lombard."³

At any rate, Benedict earned the gratitude of King Edward of England for the promotion of one of his subjects. Writing (Apr. 4, 1304) to Nicholas Alberti, cardinal-bishop of Ostia, the King begged him to thank the Pope for him as soon as he received the royal letter.

¹ Rishanger, pp. 221-2; Finke, *Mon. Arag.*, i, pp. 160, 162; B. Guidonis, p. 440, who by mistake gives the title of bishop of Spoleto to the Englishman.

² *Mon. Arag.*, ep. of J. to the Pope, Jan. 1, 1304, i, p. 156.

³ *Mon. Ar.*, i, p. 162. As bearing on this remark we may add that Benedict "is said" to have made twelve Dominican bishops in one day. *Ann. Halesbrun. maj.*, ap. *M. G. SS.*, xxiv, p. 47.

He went on to say that he intended to send special envoys as soon as possible to convey his formal thanks to the Holy Father. He had, indeed, wished to keep Wynterburne by his side, but he believed that the Pope had granted the favour to his confessor, among other reasons, on account of his love for the King and his realm.¹ When these envoys were sent is not determined ; but some envoys were sent to Benedict on June 12, others on June 28, and Edward was preparing to send yet others when he heard of the Pope's death.²

The Pope
goes to
Perugia,
Apr. 1304.

As early as March 23, Benedict had made up his mind to spend the summer in Perugia, for on that day he issued orders to the Rectors of Tuscany, Spoleto, and the March of Ancona to assist the authorities of the Commune in provisioning their city so that there might not be any shortage when the papal court arrived.³ If we were to believe Ferreti, he had made up his mind to leave Rome altogether, and to fix the papal see in Lombardy,⁴ and that on account of the turbulence of the Romans.⁵ Although, after what has just been said of Benedict's orders for the provisioning of Perugia, there is certainly no truth in what Ferreti says about the Pope's intention of fixing the papal see in Lombardy, it may be that one reason why he was in such a hurry to leave Rome for the summer was the turbulence of its nobility. For we read in John of Victring that, when the Pope was on his way from the Lateran to St. Peter's (about March 22,

¹ *Cal. of Close Rolls, Edw. I.* (1302-7), p. 204 f. Cf. Prynne, *Records*, iii, p. 1046. Edward soon began to make use of the new cardinal. See *C. of C. R., l.c.*, pp. 212, 218.

² Cf. *C. of C. R., l.c.*, pp. 211-12, and 337.

³ *Reg.*, n. 567, p. 375.

⁴ *Hist.*, i, p. 172.

⁵ *Ib.*, p. 173. "Hic Benedictus tutum se putans a gladiis impiorum, qui, Urbi tyranidem exercentes, pastoralia decreta negligebant, animo vires assumpsit."

1304),¹ one of the cardinals was seriously wounded by a missile from one of the numerous towers with which the city was studded. Benedict at once ordered the tower to be levelled to the ground, and, as his orders were resisted, he straightway set out for Perugia.²

At any rate, Benedict's *Register* shows that he left Rome for Perugia on April 9, and, halting at Isola Farnese, Monterosi, and Viterbo, entered Perugia on May 2.³ There he took up his abode in the "canonica" of S. Lorenzo, i.e., probably in the palace of its canons.

Warmly welcomed by the people of Perugia, we are assured that he felt his courage revived,⁴ and of this revival of courage he gave evidence in a discourse which he addressed to the people. From a platform adorned with hangings of cloth of gold which had been erected in the chief piazza of the city in front of his palace,⁵ he denounced before all the people the outrage committed against Boniface. He "bewailed the abominable atrocities" which had been committed not so much against the person of the Pope, as against our Lord Himself and St. Peter, whose vicar he was. It was Christ who had been outraged in his vicar. He, therefore, anathematized all who had been concerned in the

The Pope
preaches
against the
outrage at
Anagni.

¹ Potthast, ii, p. 2034.

² *Hist.*, l. iii. See different versions on pp. 336-7 and 371, ed. Schneider. Perhaps some doubt may be thrown on the accuracy of this statement as the historian appears to place it in 1303, but it is supported by the words of Ptolemy of Lucca who tells us that Benedict suddenly left the Lateran at the end of March on account of the insolence of the Romans. *H.E.*, xxiv, c. 1, Paduan version, p. 1224.

³ *Reg.*, n. 618, Apr. 9, Isola F.; n. 1316, Apr. 10, M.; n. 942, Apr. 13, Viterbo; Apr. 21, Montefiascone, n. 759; Apr. 22, Bolsena, n. 1264; May 2, Perugia, n. 908; and *Ann. di Perugia*, ap. *Archiv. stor. Ital.*, xvi, p. 60, 1850; Ferreti, i, 173.

⁴ Ferreti, *l.c.*

⁵ Such a platform is described by Nogaret, ap. Dupuy, *Hist. du dif.*, p. 314, n. 42.

sacrilege, and asserting that the divine vengeance would fall upon them, urged them to repent.¹

More
Absolutions,
May 13.

Such were the just and courageous words of Benedict ; but his acts, at least as far as France was concerned, were, it would seem, scarcely in accord with them. By encyclicals and letters addressed directly to Philip the Fair, he absolved all, cleric and lay, " in the kingdom of the Franks " (with the exception of William of Nogaret, whose absolution he reserved specially to the Holy See) from all censures they had incurred in connection with hindering communication with Rome or with " the capture of Pope Boniface ". This, he explained, he was moved to do by the maternal kindness of Holy Church, and to avoid scandal, " especially where there is question of large numbers." He expressed a hope, however, that the King of France and its people, mindful of what had been done for them, " would honour God and His Church all the more seeing that the Church had displayed such gracious mercy towards them ".² But, puppet or scoundrel, and he was confessedly one or the other, Philip was wholly incapable of appreciating any of the more refined motives that animated Benedict. He and his regarded them as solely the outcome of fear, and drew courage from them, as we shall see, shamelessly to pursue the memory of the great Boniface.

On the same day (May 13, 1304) on which he granted this absolution to all the French who had either disobeyed the orders of Boniface or outraged his person, he removed the interdicts which had been laid on Pamiers and Lyons

¹ *Flores Hist.*, iii, p. 117.

² *Reg.*, n. 1253, May 13, 1304. " Sperantes insuper quod rex et incole memorati tanto Deum et dictam ecclesiam studebunt peramplius et devotius revereri, quanto eadem ecclesia misericordius et gratiosius egerit cum eisdem." Cf. n. 1254 to Philip le Bel, and 1259, a special absolution for those who did not obey the summons of Boniface to Rome.

in connection with the encroachments which we have seen made by Philip in regard to them,¹ and all the disabilities which had been inflicted on the family of Pierre Flotte.² Moreover, with the exception of Nogaret, the other envoys of Philip, i.e., Berald of Mercœur, William of Plaisan, and the canon of Bruges, Peter of Belleperche, all succeeded in obtaining special absolutions for themselves.³

But all this was not enough for Philip and France. Seeing the great harm that was being done to the prosperity of that country by the debased coins which were being struck "by our most dear son in Christ, Philip, the illustrious King of the Franks", the Pope ordered the whole clergy of France to pay him a tenth of all ecclesiastical property for two years. This he did in order, as he said, that the money of the country might be restored to the standard it held in the days of the King's grandfather, Blessed Louis, and of his father Philip, and even in the early years of his own reign.⁴

Although, in the following month, Philip caused the absolutions of the Pope to be read out in public in the cathedral of Notre Dame,⁵ he did not change his policy for all the kindness displayed by Benedict. He continued to oppress the Cistercian monasteries because their abbot-general had refused to join in his attack on Pope Boniface.⁶

It was only some three weeks after he had absolved the greater criminals, those ultimately responsible for the

Tithes for Philip, 1304.

Proceedings against those who had outraged the person of Boniface, 1304.

¹ *Reg.*, nn. 1257-8.

² *Ib.*, n. 1260, still May 13.

³ *Ib.*, n. 1263.

⁴ *Ib.*, n. 1261, May 14, 1304. Cf. nn. 1262 and 901. Cf. Bernardus Guidonis and other French chroniclers, ap. *R. F. SS.*, xxi, pp. 136, 641, 714-15.

⁵ On June 28, 1304. Cf. Gerard de Frachet, ap. *ib.*, p. 23; also *Contin. W. of Nangis*, i, p. 342.

⁶ "Omnia monasteria molestavit." *Rishanger*, p. 224, *R. S.*

sacrilege, that Benedict condemned those who had carried out the foul deed planned by Philip and his ministers. On June 7 he issued the bull "Flagitiosum scelus",¹ declaring that for "certain good reasons", he had put off the punishment of those who had perpetrated the great crime against his predecessor. Longer, however, it could not be deferred. Certain "children of iniquity", he said, "men, the first-born of Satan," throwing reverence to the winds, though subjects, dared to assail their ruler, though sons, their father, and though vassals, their lord. Of this number were William de Nogaret, Rinaldo or Raynald of Supino and his son, Peter of Genazzano and his son, Adenolfus and Nicholas, sons of the late Mathia and other citizens of Anagni, Sciarra Colonna, John of Ceccano, and others. With arms in their hands, these men seized our predecessor with violence (*injuriose*), and with insult and blasphemy laid their impious hands upon him, whilst others plundered the treasury of the Roman Church.² These crimes of treason and sacrilege that violated every law were done before our very eyes. At such a sight, who can refrain from tears, however hard and cruel by nature he may be? However merciful a man may be, the sight of such horrors must make him hard and severe! What sanctuary now can there be when the Roman Pontiff has been outraged in his own home? Oh! miserable Anagni that suffered such deeds to be done within thy walls. May no refreshing dew nor gentle rain fall on thee more! To the other hills may they come, but as for thee, may they pass thee by! Though thou hadst the power to stay it, thou didst look on whilst the strong one fell

¹ *Reg.*, n. 1276, June 7.

² *Ib.* "Armata hostiliter et injuriose coeperunt, manus in eum injecerunt impias . . . ac blasphemiarum voces funestas ignominiose jactarunt."

and the powerful was overcome. Example ever to be dreaded, crime never to be atoned ! For its just punishment may the sons of the Church come from afar, and her daughters rise up around her !

But it is written that "the King's honour loveth judgment" (Ps. xcvi, 4), and so we must not depart by a hair's breadth from justice. Those, then, concluded the Pope, whom we have just named, and all such as had an actual share in the outrage and all who gave them help or counsel, have incurred the sentence of excommunication inflicted in such cases by the canons, as we explained before a great multitude of people. They must, therefore, appear personally before him during the octave of the coming feast of SS. Peter and Paul (June 29) to receive judgment.

What punishment the too merciful Pope would have inflicted on the culprits it is impossible to say, as he died the day after the said octave (July 7). The "new light" which Dino Compagni said had been sent by God to cheer the world¹ was extinguished all too soon. The great accounting day, however, had not yet dawned for the arch-culprit, Philip the Fair ; but about the time that Benedict lay dying, Philip was having read in the cathedral of Notre Dame at Paris, before a specially summoned body of the clergy, the absolutions pronounced by the Pope.²

We have seen already what the sober pages of history have said of the disgrace and misery that fell on the family of Philip the Fair, and on France³ after the death of Boniface VIII. and the anathemas of Benedict XI.⁴ It is equally a fact that, after Benedict, in the manner of

The ruin of
Anagni.

¹ *Chron.*, iii, c. 1. ² On June 28, *Contin. Will. of Nangis*, i, p. 342.

³ *Supra*, p. 388 ff.

⁴ Gautier, too, notes how after the fall of the family of Philip : "La France fut, pendant plus d'un siècle, condamnée à une décadence que rien ne put arrêter."

King David with regard to the mountain of Gelboe, had, cursed Anagni, that important and populous city fell into decay. During the early part of the fourteenth century a canon of Anagni erected over its cathedral door, in a niche, the seated statue of Boniface VIII. still to be seen there. He erected it in reparation of the disloyalty of its citizens in betraying that Pontiff.¹ The reparation, it would seem, was not enough. At any rate, a sixteenth century traveller, one Alexander of Bologna, wrote as follows : " Anagni, a city very old but half ruined and desolate. Passing through it in the year 1526 we saw with astonishment its immense ruins, especially of the palace once built by Boniface VIII. On asking the reason for this state of things, one of the principal inhabitants told me that the cause was the seizure of Pope Boniface. ' Since that hour,' he said, ' the city has gone steadily to ruin. War, pestilence, famine, civil discords have reduced it to the state in which you see it now. During the internal dissensions, the victorious parties always burnt the houses of the vanquished and the exiles. That is why, quite recently, the small number of its surviving citizens asked themselves what could be the cause of all their misery, and came to the conclusion that it was the unexpiated crime of the capture of Pope Boniface. They, therefore, implored Pope Clement VII. to send them a bishop to absolve them from the anathema which had been incurred by their fathers in having laid their hands on the sovereign Pontiff. This, in due course, was done.' " ² So far Alexander of Bologna and the citizens

¹ Barbier de Montault, *Œuvres complètes*, iii, p. 342.

² Ap. Raynaldus, *Ann.*, 1303, n. 43. Some historians, too, see in the sad decay that overtook Rome in the fourteenth century, a divine punishment for the way in which its citizens had in previous centuries often treated the Popes.

of Anagni. We have recorded these misfortunes that befell the family of Philip the Fair, France, and Anagni, in the spirit in which Alison in his well-known *History of Europe* records the sneer of Napoleon when he was excommunicated by Pope Pius VII. "Does he suppose," he cried, "that his words will make the muskets fall from my soldiers' hands?" The historian adds that he felt bound to note that, in the hour of Napoleon's ruin, when his army had to retreat in the depth of winter from Moscow, their muskets, their sole hope of safety from the pursuing Cossacks, did fall from his soldiers' hands.

There are some, indeed, who in reading these striking facts of history will remind themselves how many curious coincidences there are; but there are others who will recognize that there are more things in heaven and on earth than are ordinarily dreamt of and that, now in mercy, but now in anger, God still visits his people Israel!

CHAPTER III.

THE EMPIRE ; ITALY—WORK FOR PEACE IN FLORENCE,
ETC. ; STATES OF THE CHURCH ; SICILY ; THE EAST
—CRUSADE.

Albert, King
of the
Romans ;
favours,
notices, ex-
hortations.

DURING his brief pontificate there was very little opportunity for any important intercourse between the Papacy and the Empire. The relations between Benedict and Albert can be told in a few words. The former's Register shows him granting favours to the King of the Romans and his Queen,¹ as well as to his officials² and friends.³ We see him also asking his protection for churches that were oppressed by the powerful,⁴ and notifying him of the translation of bishops from one see to another.⁵ But he had to appeal to him to protect churches not only against powerful nobles, but also against himself. He turned to him in behalf of Gerard, archbishop of Mayence (Mainz). To judge from the Annals of that city, Gerard of Eppenstein would appear to have been a man who passed no little of his time in political intrigue. Under the year 1298 we read that he was one of those who brought about the fall of Adolf and the rise of Albert ; and under the year 1301 that he was engaged in conspiring against Albert. One result of this last political intrigue was that Albert attacked the possessions of the archdiocese, and Gerard only reobtained the King's favour by handing over to him, under certain conditions, a number of his towns.⁶ Whether

¹ *Reg.*, n. 67.

² *Ib.*, n. 66.

³ *Ib.*, nn. 94-5.

⁴ *Ib.*, n. 245.

⁵ *Ib.*, n. 426.

⁶ *Ann. Mogunt.*, ap. Böhmer, *Fontes*, ii, 252.

Albert failed to fulfil the conditions, or whether the archbishop was discovered intriguing afresh, trouble again arose between Gerard and the King of the Romans. The archbishop complained to the Pope, and would appear to have been able to convince him that he and his see were being oppressed by the King. Benedict accordingly wrote to Albert to say that he had been informed that he had terrified the archbishop into making agreements "to the enormous detriment of his church". He had also taken no notice of the remonstrances of the Pope's predecessor "Boniface VIII. of happy memory". At all this Benedict declared that he was the more concerned seeing that he had expected to find in Albert a really Catholic prince. He pointed out how derogatory it was in one whose duty it was to dispense justice to be guilty of injustice himself, and urged the King to make satisfaction for any wrong he had done the archbishop.¹

Benedict's representations were not without their effect. Peace was made between the King and the archbishop, who followed his sovereign to battle, and was prevented by death soon after from indulging in further intrigues.²

Obviously the relations between Benedict and the Empire were neither numerous nor important; those with Italy were rather more extensive, if not much more outstanding. Troubles caused by factions and trade rivalries were at this moment rife all over the north and centre of Italy, but nowhere were they worse than in Florence. Attempts to
make peace
in Florence,
1304.

A lover of peace for its own sake, Benedict tried to bring the distracted city to peace, and to procure the return of the exiles, including Dante. If we can rely on

¹ Ep. March 11, 1304.

² Siffrid of Balnhusen, *Compend. hist.*, ii, ann. 1304-5; ap. Struve, *Rev. Germ. SS.*, i, p. 1053-4, or ap. *M. G. SS.*, xxv.

Dino Compagni, the Whites and Ghibellines of Florence were greatly pleased when the Dominican bishop of Spoleto, Nicholas of Prato, was made a cardinal, because he was of a Ghibelline stock. They accordingly worked that he might be appointed by the Pope as legate to their city.¹ However it was brought about, Benedict decided to send cardinal Nicholas as "pacificator" to Florence. On January 31, 1304, the large number of bulls usually sent to a legate were addressed to Nicholas.² They gave him all the necessary powers, and informed all whom it might concern that he had been duly appointed.

"When our Lord," wrote the Pope to the new legate of Tuscany, Romagnola, and the March of Treviso, "was about to pass from this world to the Father, he left his disciples a legacy of peace, saying: 'Peace I leave with you, my peace I give unto you' (S. John xiv, 27) . . . As, then, the Vicar on earth of One . . . who loved peace above all things, among the manifold toils which the malice of the times has to a greater degree than usual cast upon us, we consider the care of peace the most important. To that care is our mind specially drawn seeing that we have the pastoral charge of all the faithful. Over it do all our senses watch, and all our thought and toil is directed to keeping all the said faithful in a state of perfect peace."³

The power of the legate, whose virtues the Pope highly extolled,⁴ was extended, not only to the places just mentioned, but to the patriarchates of Aquileia and Grado, Ravenna and even "the parts of Venice",⁵ and

¹ *Chron.*, iii, 1.

² *Reg.*, nn. 1171-1205.

³ *Reg.*, n. 1172.

⁴ *Ib.* "De te igitur, quem Largitor bonorum, omnium scientiarum et aliarum virtutum munere decoravit, etc."

⁵ *Ib.*, n. 1171.

he was empowered to punish the heads of any of those provinces who should prove disobedient.¹

It was not till the tenth of March that cardinal Nicholas entered Florence. He was received with great honour by the people, "as by men," says Villani, "who felt themselves to be divided and in evil state."² According to the same historian: "this cardinal Niccolo was . . . very wise in learning and of natural intelligence, subtle, sagacious, and cautious, and very experienced. By descent he was of the Ghibellines, and it was afterwards seen that he favoured them greatly."³ Such is the view of the "Black" Villani. But, as the "White" Dino ascribes any supposed false move made by the cardinal to interested advice which was given to him, we may perhaps conclude that, all through, he displayed "the good and impartial intentions" which Villani acknowledges that he showed at first. Whether partial or impartial, he had a very difficult task. He had to try to reconcile one party of Blacks with another party, the Blacks with the Whites, and the Guelfs with the Ghibellines. With all conceivable impartiality, it would have been almost impossible to reconcile such factions.

The cardinal opened his work for peace by getting in touch with the exiles. Acting in their behalf, and as secretary of their leader, Alessandro da Romena,⁴ Dante

¹ *Ib.*, n. 1204.

² *Chron.*, viii, 69; Dino, iii, 4.

³ *Ib.* As usual Selfe's translation. Leonardo Bruni, *Hist. Florent.*, lib. iv, p. 94, ap. *R. I. SS.*, xix, pt. iii, new ed., however, says that the cardinal, after carefully studying the divisions of the citizens, came to the wise conclusion that the greatest differences were between the nobles and the people, and so "partes animo complexus est plebis", because he believed that they were less obstinately opposed to the return of the exiles, and less bitterly attached to faction. Leonardo, then, evidently believed in the cardinal's impartiality.

⁴ It is believed that he "resumed the position of their leader after the defeat of the Ordelaffi". Cf. E. H. Plumptre, *The Commedia of Dante*, i, p. lxxxii, London, 1890.

The cardinal
of Prato
enters
Florence,
March, 1304.

addressed him a very respectful letter.¹ The hearts, he said, of the Bianchi had been filled with joy at his kind words. All that they desired was the peace and freedom of the city (Florence), the correction of abuses, and their own restoration. They were ready, as devout sons of the Church, to sheathe their swords, and to submit to his arbitration.

Failure of
the cardinal's
mission.

At first all seemed to go well, and it appeared as though the cardinal would succeed.² But suspicion of his impartiality on the one hand, and, much more, craft and deceit on the part of those whom he was striving to benefit, spoilt all his work. Ghibelline and White representatives appeared in the city and were well received "by the common people", but, according to Dino, the Blacks had no wish for peace, so that the Whites thought it safer to leave the city. The cardinal, however, still hoping to bring about a reconciliation, remained there. But those in power, as we have said, had seemingly no wish for peace, and wanted to get rid of him. Accordingly, says Dino, "one family, called the Quaratesi, who lived near . . . the palace where the cardinal was staying, made as though they would shoot him. When he complained of this, he was advised to leave the city; and so, being in fear, he departed on the 9th of June for Perugia where the Pope then was, leaving the city in evil plight."³ On taking his departure, he is said to have thus addressed the Florentines: "Seeing that ye desire to be at war and under a curse, and do not desire

¹ Ep. 1, p. 403, ap. Moore, *Opere di Dante*, i, p. 403; in English ap. *The Latin Works of Dante*, Temple Classics, p. 295 ff.

² Paolino Pieri, *Cron.*, pp. 78-9, describes the festivals that were held in honour of "the peace". Cf. Villani, viii, 70.

³ *Chron.*, iii, 7. Cf. the report of one of his envoys to James of Aragon: "Florentini et Lucani non ei (the legate) obedierunt, immo occidere voluerunt, unde major discordia et majores strages sunt modo quam primo fuerint inter eos." Ap. Finke, *Mon. Ar.*, p. 177.

to have rest or peace among yourselves, abide with the curse of God and Holy Church." Thus, says Villani, whom we are quoting,¹ "he excommunicated the citizens, and left the city under an interdict, whence it was held that, by this curse, whether just or unjust, there fell great peril on our city through the adversities, which came to pass therein but a short time after."²

Whilst cardinal Nicholas was still on his mission of peace in Tuscany, he had gone to his native Prato, in order to quell the civil discords of its citizens. But, so far was he from succeeding, that he had to fly for his life. He, therefore, excommunicated its inhabitants, laid the city under an interdict, and called on the Florentines to make war upon them and punish them.³

Benedict calls the Florentines to account, 1304.

Duly informed of what was in progress,⁴ Benedict supported his legate. Writing to his beloved sons, "the Podestà, the Captain, the Priors, the Standard-bearer of justice, and the Council and Commune of Florence," he complained that some of their citizens and certain men of Prato, supported, too, by Lucca, disturbers of the peace, paying no regard to the Roman Church, raised a tumult in Prato when cardinal Nicholas was there, and forced him to return to Florence. The Pope then proceeded to impress upon the Florentines that he was astonished that their love of justice had not led them at once to punish this outrage. It looked as though the taste of liberty which they had enjoyed, had soon begotten nausea.

¹ *Chron.*, viii, 69. The contemporary Simone della Tosa, *Annali*, ann. 1303 and 1304. According to this author one cause of the tumults in the city was the desire of Corso Donati, one of the leaders of the Blacks, to use them to enable him to plunder the people.

² In the faction fights a large portion of the city was destroyed by fire. Cf. Paolino, *l.c.*, p. 79 f.; Villani, *l.c.*, viii, c. 71; Marchione Stefani, *Cron. Fiorent.*, Rubr., 242, ap. *R. I. SS.*, xxx, pl. 1, p. 91, new ed.

³ Villani, viii, 69.

⁴ "Per litteras memorati legati accepimus." *Reg.*, n. 1278.

If love of justice would not move them to act, let fear for themselves move them ; for, if they do not make the people of Prato respect them, they will find themselves their prey. Should they, nevertheless, not concern themselves to avenge the insult to the Roman Church, it will be necessary for him, by the seizure of their property everywhere, and by other temporal and spiritual penalties, to proceed against their city.¹

Soon after the dispatch of this letter, cardinal Nicholas returned to the Pope, and told him of the complete failure of his mission caused by the violence of the men of Prato, and the apathy of the Florentines which, in turn, was brought about by their intricate and bitter factions.² Thereupon, strongly denouncing the treatment of his legate, and all the evils which their discords were daily inflicting on men and things,³ Benedict ordered the Communes of Florence and Lucca to send suitable proctors to him before the close of the octave of the approaching feast of SS. Peter and Paul (June 29). He also mentioned by name such Florentine and other faction leaders as Rosso della Tosa, Corso Donati, Gerard de Tornaquinci, etc., with whose doings the pages of Dino Compagni and Villani are full, and ordered them to come to him with the representatives of the Communes.⁴

But alas ! Benedict's days were numbered, and the terrible faction fights which this peace-loving Pontiff might have modified if not have brought to an end, went

¹ Ep. of May 29, 1304, ap. *Reg.*, n. 1322.

² Villani, viii, 72.

³ As a man of learning, Benedict contrasted the barbarities engendered by the civil strife in Florence, etc., with certain well-known deeds of violence in antiquity : " Non perfidior Catiline conjuratio, vix superior Syllana crudelitas, et Mariana ferocitas parum minor." Ep. of June 21, 1304, ap. *Reg.*, n. 1278. We are on the threshold of the Renaissance.

⁴ *Ib.*

on unchecked, as he died on the day after the period he had fixed for meeting the authors of the strife (July 7).

The Florentine leaders, who, Villani tells us, had "straightway come obediently . . . in great state . . . to defend themselves before the Pope against the charges which the cardinal of Prato had made against them,"¹ had to return in haste. The Ghibelline and White party in Tuscany and the Romagna, treacherously informed by the cardinal, according to the same author, of the departure of the Black leaders for Perugia, had hastily marched on their city.²

If, however, Benedict and his legate had no success in establishing peace in Florence, he succeeded better elsewhere. Sanudo, in his *Lives of the Doges*, tells us, in connection with that of Doge Pietro Gradenigo, that trouble arose between the Venetians and the Paduans because, contrary to treaties, the latter built a fortress at Pettadebo, between Chioggia and Montealbano, in order that they might control the salt pans there.³ Remonstrances on the part of the Venetians led to no result. They accordingly took measures to prevent the salt water from entering the pans, and commenced hostilities. Hereupon, Pope Benedict, holding, as he wrote, the place of the Prince of Peace on earth, commissioned Alberic, bishop of Fermo, to approach the disputants in person, and with his well-known prudence to strive to reconcile them. At the same time he implored the authorities of Padua and Venice to hearken to his "messenger of peace", because he foresaw that, if the

Peace
between
Venice and
Padua, 1304.

¹ *L.c.*

² Had we used the "Documents relatifs à la légation du Card. de Prato en Toscane," published by C. Grandjean, ap. *Mélanges d'archéol. et d'hist.*, 1883, p. 379 ff., we should have had to devote much more space to the legation, and it seems scarcely worth it.

³ Ap. *R. I. SS.*, xxii, p. 581.

war between them were to continue, very great harm would befall not them only but others also.¹ Benedict did not live to see the end of the struggle between the cities, but the work of pacification begun by him was concluded soon after his death (Oct. 5, 1304).² Work of this noble kind took up no little of Benedict's short pontificate, and many cities, Ascoli, Orvieto, Bolsena, etc., profited by his exertions in the cause of peace.³

Justice for
Pietro
Gaetani, etc.

Still acting in the cause of peace and justice, Benedict supported Peter Gaetani, count of Caserta. We have seen how, on the death of Boniface, a general attack was made upon his family. A number of Umbrian nobles, availing themselves of the opportunity, seized "castrum Jovis" in the diocese of Amelia, which belonged to the nephew of the late Pope. On the count's complaining to him of this outrage, Benedict at once ordered the rector of the patrimony in Tuscany to proceed against the intruders, unless within eight days they had restored the place and its castle to its rightful owner, and had made satisfaction to him for any damage they may have caused.⁴

Also with the intent "of procuring peace",⁵ Benedict restored to the citizens of Benevento their municipal rights of which they had been deprived by Pope Martin. The people had complained to him that the rectors of the city, unrestrained by any local magistrates, had been guilty of every kind of extortion and injustice. Harkening,

¹ *Reg.*, epp. of May 27, 1304, nn. 1248-50.

² See the conditions of peace, etc., ap. S. Romanin, *Storia di Venezia*, vol. iii, pp. 6-8.

³ *Reg.*, nn. 91, 108.

⁴ *Ib.*, n. 270. To facilitate the hearing of cases referred to the Holy See, Benedict instituted a special judge of criminal appeal cases. *Ib.*, n. 1154.

⁵ "Vos vero, filii, . . . nobis estis dominicus grex commissi, ideoque pro vobis consilium sumere, procurare pacem, et ut illesi sitis, debemus accuratius vigilare." *Ib.*, n. 665, Jan. 18, 1304.

accordingly, to the petition of the citizens, he restored to them the right of electing consuls and other officials in order that the tyranny and cupidity of the electors might be restrained. In granting their request, Benedict told them that he suspected that they had not been deprived of their rights without good reason, and that they had best walk warily, as he had restored their powers to see how they would use them. Finally, on condition of their paying annually four thousand florins of gold to the Holy See on the feast of St. Peter, the citizens could collect for themselves all the taxes which were due to it.¹

Despite appearances to the contrary, Benedict did not spend all his short pontificate in reversing the policy of his immediate predecessors. We have seen that Boniface VIII., to secure the aid of James II. of Aragon, had invested him with the islands of Corsica and Sardinia, of which he was the overlord, and that James had duly done homage for them. No sooner, then, did he hear in Valencia of the election of Benedict than he decided to send ambassadors to him to renew his homage, and so to gain recognition of his claims from the new Pope. They appeared before Benedict in June, and he not only accepted their master's homage for the islands, but unconditionally granted him the ecclesiastical tithes of his country for three years.²

James II. of Aragon renews his homage, 1304.

Benedict's pontificate was not so short that he had not time to turn his attention both to the East of Europe and to Asia. Through the French princess, Helen,³ the wife of King Urosh I. of Servia, Latin influence, greatly to the benefit of the country, made considerable progress

Servia.

¹ Cf. S. Borgia, *Mem. istor. di Benevento*, ii, pp. 169-71.

² Zurita, *Anales de Aragon*, i, 419 v., c. 65.

³ Prince Lazarovich, *The Servian People*, ii, p. 470, says that she was a cousin of King Charles of Anjou.

in Servia. During the sixty-four years Queen Helen († 1314) spent in Servia, she established schools, endowed churches of the Latin rite, and "founded at least one Latin monastery on the Ibar".¹ For the furtherance of Catholic influence, she had some time before entered into communication with Pope Nicholas IV.²; then with Boniface VIII.,³ and was now in touch with Benedict. As a reward, as he explained, for her devotion to the Holy See, the last-named Pontiff took her and her kingdom under the special protection of the Holy See.⁴ About a month later, he wrote to her son Stephen Urosh II., Milutin (1282-1321), on the subject of ecclesiastical unity. He told the King how grieved Holy Mother Church ever was when she saw any of her children straying from her side, and how anxious she was to bring them back to the way of truth. He had heard with joy from trustworthy sources that the King and his people were eagerly desirous of returning "to the unity of the faith". Various circumstances, too, continued the Pope, appeared to confirm the report. He therefore urged the King to carry out his intention without delay.⁵ But it seems that the "circumstances" to which Benedict alluded had deceived others besides himself. The Kings of Servia, which at this period was fighting its way to Empire, to the position of the most powerful state in the Balkan peninsula, would appear to

¹ H. Temperley, *History of Serbia*, p. 54.

² Cf. Theiner, *Vet. mon. Slav. merid.*, i, n. 152, p. 111, June 11, 1291. See also *Reg. Nicol. IV.*, nn. 6710-14; and A. d'Avril, *La Serbie Chrétienne*, p. 119.

³ Theiner, *l.c.*, n. 168.

⁴ Theiner, *Mon. Hungar.*, i, n. 648, Nov. 18, 1303. Cf. *Reg.*, nn. 125-6. A month or two later, Benedict also took under the protection of the Holy See, Beatrice of Savoy and her territories. *Reg.*, 623 of Feb. 19, 1304. Cf. n. 847.

⁵ *Reg.*, 134, or Theiner, *ubi infra*, n. 653.

have been ready enough to treat amicably with the Papacy with regard to Dalmatia and their western dependencies generally, because large portions of them had for centuries been united with Rome. But, with regard to Servia proper or Rashka (Rascia) where most of the people were of the Greek rite and were in schism, it would seem that they had no real intention of trying to unite it with Rome. Benedict was, therefore, left to bewail the decay of faith in the territories subject to the Byzantine Basileus, Andronicus II., and in those of Milutin, and his brother Stephen Dragutin, and of our most dear daughter in Christ, Helen, Queen of Servia, their mother.¹

Other circumstances besides the affairs of Servia turned the attention of Benedict to Andronicus II. and the Empire of Constantinople. Among those who had fought for Frederick of Sicily was the German adventurer, ex-Templar, and soldier of fortune, Roger de Flor. After the peace of Caltabellota, he had taken service with Andronicus II., raised a body of Catalans, and with his *Grand Company* had gone to fight the Turks. He had already scored various successes against them; and, just at this period (1303), he had gained a great victory over them at Philadelphia.²

But it was Charles of Valois who was to fix the thoughts of the Pope on Constantinople. Since his marriage with Catherine, the daughter and heiress of Philip of Courtenay, titular Emperor of Constantinople (1301), Charles had

¹ Ep. of Nov. 18, 1303, ap. Theiner, *Mon. Hungar.*, i, p. 408, n. 560. Benedict was, however, working for reform in the western and southern portions of the kingdom of Servia, as this and other letters prove. Cf. *ib.*, n. 649.

² Muntaner, *Chron.*, c. 205. Cf. Buchon, *Recherches sur la domination française dans l'empire Grec*, i, p. 48, and especially G. Schlumberger, *Expédition des Almugavares (1302-11)*, chap. i, Paris, 1924.

always been bent on making an attempt to recover the Empire for his wife. Knowing that the Popes believed that, if Constantinople were firmly fixed in Latin hands, the expulsion of the Moslem from the Holy Land would be easy, he sent to Benedict his chancellor, Master de Perche, and Pierre d'Erboville, to ask for his support. In his reply to Charles, whom, he said, the Holy See regarded as a well-beloved son, and as distinguished by his illustrious deeds, the Pope professed his readiness to help him in his attempt to recover "the Empire of Constantinople", by assigning to him various moneys and privileges, usually granted to those who were taking part in a Crusade. But, considering the present state of France, he did not see his way to ordering a general preaching of a Crusade. Should, however, the condition of affairs in that country improve, he will do everything for Charles, unless a general Crusade takes place in the meanwhile.¹ Take up the work, then, urged Benedict, with your wonted greatness of soul, and when you have taken it up, carry it through like a strong man, and apostolic support will not be wanting for you.²

Benedict was as good as his word. The bishop of Senlis was ordered to collect the moneys of which he had spoken, and to pay them over to Charles as the Holy See should direct³; and at the same time a special letter urged

¹ A sixteenth century author (Giles of Viterbo, *Hist. vicesimi sæculi*, MS., p. 198, cited by Gautier, p. 148 f.) declares that the aged Pope was working night and day to promote a Crusade when death overtook him. It is certain, at any rate, that he strove hard to prevent Christians from supplying the Saracens with materials of war. Cf. *Reg.*, nn. 163, 545-6, 819, 861, 1101, 1315, etc.

² Ep. of June 27, 1304, ap. *Reg.*, n. 1008. Potthast dates this bull May 28, and in view of the two following letters, it would seem that the date June 27 is too late.

³ Ep. of June 20, 1304, ap. *ib.*, n. 1006. In these moneys, the tithes were not included.

the faithful to help the count in his enterprise.¹ "We have seen," wrote the Pope, "the illustrious Empire of Constantinople separated from that religion which was wont to flourish there, and we have seen it occupied by Michael Palæologus and then by his son Andronicus, and their schismatical followers who have deviated from the faith of Christ." Benedict then pointed out what a great danger it would be to the Christian faith, if the Turks who were constantly attacking Andronicus should get possession of Constantinople. Charles, in right of his wife, was prepared to wrest it from the feeble hands of the Greeks who were incapable of holding it against the infidel. Men should be moved to help him without any exhortation of the Pope, if only they would call to mind what outrages the Greeks had heaped not only on the Roman, but on the whole Church, and if they would realize the contempt and hatred of it displayed by them as well as their erroneous faith.²

But neither the eloquence of Benedict XI. nor tithes granted to Charles by Clement V. availed anything. The expedition of Charles of Valois never matured.³

¹ Ep. 1007 of the same date.

² Ep. 1007. "Si enim consideratis, filii, quantas Græcorum Ecclesia non solum Romanæ sed toti Ecclesiæ contumelias inferat, si contemptum sciretis eorum, si ipsorum errorem in Fide, si odium nosceretis, sine hortatu nostro contra eos caperetis arma ac negotium Fidei ardentibus animis sumeretis."

³ Cf. J. Delaville le Roulx, *La France en Orient*, pp. 44-7.

CHAPTER IV.

THE BRITISH ISLES.

apal grant
o Edward.

IT may be remembered that in 1302 Boniface VIII. ordered a levy of an ecclesiastical tenth for three years in England and Ireland and assigned half of it to King Edward and half to himself. He also ordered Master Bartholomew of Ferentino, a canon of London, to see that the King got his share.¹

No sooner did word reach Edward that Pope Boniface was dead, than he sent word to Master Bartholomew to hold, under pain of forfeiture of all he had, *all* the moneys derived from the tenth, until otherwise ordered, and to pay over to him what was his due.² This order was followed by a letter to Pope Benedict in which Edward declared that in granting him half the tenth for three years, Boniface had decreed that, if he died within the three years, the King could still receive the remainder of the three years due. This he wrote on Nov. 30, 1303, from Dunfermline.³ Then, on the ground that Boniface's arrangement was that if he died before the expiration of the three years, or if the war for the recovery of Sicily was to finish before the close of the three years, Edward was to have whatever remained to be collected of the tithe, the King ordered his clerk, John of Drokenesford to receive the *whole* of what remained of the tithe, and guaranteed him against any claim on the part of Pope Benedict.⁴

¹ Cf. Bliss, *Cal. of Papal Reg.*, i, pp. 598-9.

² *Cal. of Close Rolls, Edw. I.* (1302-7), Nov. 1, 1303, pp. 61-2. The same order was sent to Ireland. Cf. *ib.*, pp. 113, 118-20, 123, 141, 183.

³ *Cal. of Patent Rolls* (1301-7), p. 200; cf. p. 211.

⁴ See letters of John of D. and Edward of Nov. 30, 1303, and June 17, 1305, ap. *ib.*, pp. 200 and 365.

Whether the Pope regarded Edward's statements and interpretations as well-founded, or whether he protested against them or allowed them to pass by default, does not appear to be known. But we do know that Benedict did not get all he wanted from England. He had received a petition for support from Hugh, bishop of Byblus (mod. Jubeil). This fortified Phœnician city, situated at the foot of Mt. Lebanon, had been taken by the Saracens, and so its bishop was homeless. Benedict, accordingly, assigned to him the priory of Coldingham in Scotland, which was under the control of the bishop of Durham, and duly notified the latter that he had given permission to the exiled bishop of Byblus to hold it till he should have recovered his see.¹ Hugh, accordingly, applied for the position. His petition was, however, rejected by the bishops and lords who formed the King's council. They declared that to grant his petition "would be manifestly prejudicial to the rights of the King".²

As this resolution was passed during the long vacancy of the Holy See which followed the death of Benedict, no more was heard about it.

Although Benedict recalled all the provisions, reservations, and the rest which had been granted by his predecessor, he did not discontinue the system. This is clear from his letters to England which show him granting, for instance, a canonry and prebend of Lincoln to one Lawrence, a member of the well-known Capocci family in Rome.³ One of the Visconti of Milan is presented with another canonry and prebend of the same cathedral,⁴ and other foreigners were granted provisions of livings in various parts of the country. George de Salutiis,

¹ Bliss, *C. of P. R.*, i, 613; *Reg.*, 634, Apr. 3, 1304.

² Apr. 5, 1305. Cf. *Records of Parliament in 1305*, p. 297 ff., *R. S.*, or Rymer, ii, 958-9.

³ Bliss, *Cal. of Papal Registers*, i, p. 611.

⁴ *Ib.*, p. 612.

No benefice
for the
bishop of
Byblus.

Provisions.

though under age, and only in minor orders, was given a canonry and prebend of York, with permission to hold the precentorship of Salisbury, to which a canonry and prebend were attached, and also the church of Wilmersele in the diocese of York.¹ The convent of St. Sixtus in Rome drew a revenue of 50 marks free of tithes from that of St. Oswald, Nostle²; and two cardinals, Francis Napoleon Orsini of Sta. Lucia, and Luca Freschi of Sta. Maria in via Lata, received pensions from the dioceses of Worcester and Winchester respectively.³ It is interesting to note with regard to the foreigners holding livings in England that, if Benedict exempted them from residence, it was generally for a short period of years, in order that they might study at a university.⁴

Arrears of
tribute and
taxes to be
collected.

We have seen throughout the thirteenth century taxes of various kinds laid on the clergy of England by Popes and General Councils. But it is very often easier to impose them than to collect them. Accordingly we find Pope Benedict sending as nuncio to England, Gerard de Pecoraria, canon of Rheims, and his chaplain in order to collect arrears of such taxes as had been imposed not merely by Nicholas IV., but as far back as the days of Gregory X. He was ordered to collect the arrears of the Holy Land tax, of Peter's Pence, and of the tribute due from the Kings of our country. With regard to Peter's Pence, he was instructed to warn the bishops to carry out the regulations of Nicholas IV. as to its collection, and, if necessary, to call in the aid of the secular arm to insure that what had been collected should be handed over to him.⁵

¹ *Ib.*, p. 613.

² *Ib.*, p. 612.

³ *Ib.*, p. 616.

⁴ *Ib.*, p. 612, 614, 616. It is interesting to note that out of consideration for his baker, "panetarii et familiaris d. papæ," Benedict granted a benefice to his nephew. *Reg.*, n. 1042.

⁵ *Ib.*, p. 617; *Reg.*, nn. 1213-1222.

CHAPTER V.

BENEDICT AND THE RELIGIOUS ORDERS. FINANCE. MISCELLANEOUS ITEMS. DEATH OF THE POPE.

As a religious, it was but natural that Pope Benedict should show favours to the Religious Orders in general,¹ and as a Dominican, it was but natural that he should show special favour to the members of his own Order. He not only renewed the bull "Mare Magnum" of Boniface VIII.² in behalf of the Friars Preachers, but issued bull after bull granting them money and favours of every kind.³ Hence a Dominican of Parma, who compiled a chronicle about the year 1320, which he afterwards continued to 1344, wrote of him: "He led a holy life, and there was not a Dominican convent in the province of Lombardy on which he did not bestow many favours, especially on the one in Parma."⁴

Favours were also forthcoming for the Humiliati,⁵ and he finally confirmed the Order of the Servites, or Servants of Our Lady,⁶ a mendicant Order, founded in Florence by seven young nobles in 1240. It had received

¹ *Reg.*, n. 57, protection of the Dominicans and Franciscans of Ascoli against episcopal proceedings against them under the bull of Boniface VIII. "Super cathedram." Cf. *Mart. Polon. contin. Ang.*, ap. *M. G. SS.*, xxiv, p. 256.

² Ap. Potthast, n. 24344, May 19, 1296, "ut in Regesto secundi anni d. Bonifatii P. VIII., capitulo ccii., de verbo ad verbum usque in finem." *Reg.*, n. 902, Apr. 6, 1304.

³ *Reg.*, nn. 558, 660, 687, 918, for money. Cf. also 689, 691, 693, 860 ff., 1228, 1230.

⁴ *Chron.*, ap. *Notices et extraits*, vol. xxxv, p. 365, ed. L. Delisle. The author has for the most part only copied Ptolemy of Lucca. Cf. *Ann. Parm. Maj.*, ap. *M. G. SS.*, xxiii, p. 731.

⁵ *Reg.*, nn. 390, 512-16.

⁶ *Reg.*, n. 469, Feb. 11, 1304.

an approval from cardinal Raniero Capocci, papal legate in Tuscany (March 13, 1249), and a formal confirmation by Alexander IV. (March 23, 1256).¹ But, till the bull of Benedict, its continued existence as an Order was in jeopardy.

Want of
money.

A very special concern of Benedict was want of money. The ravages of the Tartars in Eastern Europe, the disorders in Germany caused by the vacancy of the Empire, the faction fights in Italy, the wars against the Moors in Spain, the conflicts between England, Scotland, and France, and the monetary campaign of Philip the Fair against Boniface VIII.—all directly or indirectly had an unfavourable effect upon the pontifical treasury. Then, too, as we have seen, such important tributaries of the Holy See as England and Sicily were behindhand with their payments, and finally the followers of Nogaret and Sciarra Colonna had, at the time of the sacrilege of Anagni, plundered the papal treasury.²

It was to recover what the Church and private persons had lost at the hands of those who had outraged his predecessor that Benedict turned his attention at first. Master Roiardi was, as we have seen, promptly commissioned to use every means in his power to get back as much as possible of what had been plundered.³ It would appear that the mission of Roiardi was not without result as the "Inventory of the treasury of the Roman Church" made under Clement V.⁴ shows the presence of a large number of the valuables that figure in the inventories of Boniface VIII.

¹ Potthast, n. 16302.

² Dishonest bankers also caused loss to the Holy See. Cf. *Reg.*, n. 1109.

³ Epp. of Dec. 7, 1203, ap. Raynaldus, *Ann.*, 1303, n. 57. Cf. Theiner, *Cod. Dip.*, i, n., p. 395; *Reg.*, nn. 1099, 1100, 1119-20.

⁴ Ap. vol. i of the Appendixes to the *Reg.* of Cl. V.

At the moment we are only concerned with revenues for the general purposes of the Holy See, and not with particular collections which had been ordered by it for specific objects, as, for instance, for the Holy Land expeditions. Benedict did not indeed neglect these latter, and many of his letters deal with arrangements for recovering the arrears of such collections ordered as far back as the days of Gregory X.¹ But, under the circumstances of the depletion of his treasury, he had to give special attention to the collecting of the subsidy, which Boniface had demanded "for the needs and necessities of the Roman Church".² Accordingly, in order, as he explained, that he might have the tithe "without delay, in promptu", he wrote to the different prelates who had been appointed collectors of it, and commanded them to pay over at once what they had in hand to different bankers. The French bishops were ordered to entrust their receipts to the Circuli company of Florence, "bankers of our treasury," as were also Masters Gabriel and John de Châlon who had been sent to raise the tithe in different dioceses in Germany.³ In sending in their accounts from different countries, the collectors were instructed to state the value in gold florins of the sums they sent in.⁴ Unfortunately, owing to the loss of Benedict's treasury accounts, we have no means of finding out what those sums were.

Like his predecessors, Benedict protected the merchant bankers whom they found so useful.⁵ Thus, in behalf

Collection of
the aid
demanded
by Boniface.

Benedict
protects the
mercatores.

¹ *Reg.*, 1213.

² *Reg.*, n. 181, Jan. 13, 1304, letters to various French prelates, collectors of the tithe "pro oneribus et necessitatibus Ecclesie Romane".

³ *Reg.*, nn. 1273 and 534.

⁴ *Reg.*, n. 1232; cf. nn. 181 and 534.

⁵ Cf. Bliss, *Cal. of Papal Reg.*, pp. 611 and 614, where the archbishop of Cashel is warned to pay back money to the Clarentes, and the bishop of Durham to the Advocati of Florence.

of the Amannati of Pistoia, some of whose members formed part of the papal household,¹ we see him ordering one of his officials in England, Gerard of Pecoraria, to cause all who owed money to that firm to pay it, together with additions to cover losses, interest, and expenses.²

The
Bamberg
palfrey.

One curious item of papal revenue into which Benedict looked was the white palfrey which, in sign of homage, the bishops of Bamberg were bound to give to the Pope every year. For some seven years the animals had not been sent. As the bishop pleaded that his diocese was overwhelmed with debt, the Pope freed him from the necessity of sending the seven palfreys which were due, but let him understand that the palfrey had to be sent in future.³

Character
and death of
Benedict,
July 7, 1304.

As the pontificate of Benedict XI. is not important enough to detain us longer, we may now narrate its closing scene. Though, according to Boniface VIII. and other contemporaries, Nicholas Boccasini was "a distinguished member of the Roman Church", and was endowed with great learning and prudence and many other virtues,⁴ he would appear to have been wanting

¹ *Reg.* 1109. "Qui (socii de societate Amannatorum) tunc in Romana curia morabantur." While there they had been guilty of robbery. When this company "burst", Benedict was at great pains to "float" it again. Cf. *Reg.*, nn. 882-7, 1109, 1151.

² Bliss, *l.c.*, p. 615. In another letter, *ib.*, p. 611, Benedict authorized the borrowing of a sum of money "with the usual safeguards against usury". Unfortunately, he does not state what constituted "interest", and what "usury".

³ *Reg.*, n. 1060.

⁴ Epp. nn. 619 and 621, ap. Theiner, *Mon. Hungar.*, i, p. 386 ff. Villani, *Chron.*, viii, 66, 80; Ferreti, vol. i, p. 167; the contemporary Dominican preacher, R. Girolami, *Sermoni*, ed. G. Salvadori, ap. *Scritti varii al prof. E. Monaci*, p. 490, Rome, 1901, etc. Dino Compagni, l. iii, c. 1, calls him also steadfast, virtuous, discreet, and holy, though Pipinus, *Chron.*, ap. *R. I. SS.*, ix, p. 747, would turn his "steadfastness" into obstinacy: "fuerit adeo pertinacissimus conceptionis, ut quod semel de aliquo in se concepisset, sive in bonum, sive in malum,

in self-reliance. Men who knew him assert that he did nothing without the advice of others.¹ His character in this respect was the reverse of that of his great predecessor who is said to have often acted without taking the advice of the cardinals. No doubt, in taking advice, Benedict did well ; but, if it be the fact that the cardinals, speaking generally, were openly merely party men, Benedict must in all his acts have been merely following the opinion of some party or other. Sometimes, indeed, so we are told, he did not act at all, because, owing to divergent party views of the cardinals, he could not get a lead from them.²

In any age and under any circumstances, his gentle disposition, his learning, and his priestly virtues generally, would have made Pope Benedict XI. an ornament to the Church ; but, under other circumstances, he might have been more useful to it. In " the piping times of peace " his piety would have edified the Church and his learning instructed it. But many other things besides laws are silent in times of war, and Benedict was not the man to cry Havoc ! and to let loose the dogs of war on Philip the Fair. On the contrary, he cried Peace ! when there was no peace, and thus gave courage to the King of France to heap further outrage on the devoted head of his predecessor.

Perhaps to insinuate that the Orsini had great influence over him personally, or, at any rate, that they had at this period great influence in the Church, the illustrated lampoon known as the *Initium malorum*

ab inde non posset avelli." But as contemporaries inform us that he only acted on the advice of the cardinals, the assertion of Pipinus does not count for much. See the report of his agent Garsias to James II., ap. *Aus den Tagen Bonifaz VIII.*, p. lviii of Finke. " D. Papa quasi nichil per se facit nisi cum consilio cardinalium, qui sunt divisi."

¹ " Per se nichil facit nisi aliorum consilio." Garsias again, ap. Finke, *Mon. Aragon.*, i, p. 159.

² See the continuation of the last two notes.

which we have often cited, represents Benedict with a mitre on his head, and wearing "the great mantle", and by his side an erect she-bear whose udders are being sucked by two "cubs".¹

According to one of our chroniclers, Benedict had now reached "a great age"; a great age, i.e., according to mediaeval reckoning,² for Ferreti says he was only sixty-five. At any rate, he fell ill of dysentery about the feast of the Nativity of St. John the Baptist (June 24), and died on Tuesday, July 7, 1304.³ Up to comparatively recent times both the date and cause of the death of Benedict were uncertain. It is now as certain that he died a natural death at Perugia on July 7, 1304, as it is that he did not die by eating poisoned figs which the gold of Philip le Bel induced two of the papal cooks to prepare for him.⁴

Tomb and
miracles.

The deceased Pontiff was buried in the morning of Wednesday, July 8, "with great honour" in front of the high altar in the Church of the Friars Preachers in Perugia.⁵ In due course, the body of the holy Pope was

¹ Ap. Pipinus, *Chron.*, iv, 48. The sixteenth century *Vaticinia Joachimi* call him the black bird that dissipated the works of Nero (Boniface VIII.), and allude to his death at Perugia from eating poisoned figs.

² "Vir (Benedict) magnæ ætatis, sanctæ vitæ et eminentis litteraturæ." *Ann. reg. Ed. I.*, p. 492, printed with Rishanger, *R. S.*

³ "Sic inter festa S. Johannis et bb. Petri et Pauli app., d. Papa fuit graviter infirmatus, et die martis nonas Julii post meridiem, ante nonam, diem clausit extremum." Garsias to James II., ap. Finke, *Mon. Ar.*, i, p. 176. "Senyor, lo papa es mort di disinteria, e durali tro en XV dies." "Dimarts VII. dies anats de Juyol plach a Jhesu Christ que mori el papa en la ciutat de Perusa." Vidal de Villano to James II., ap. *ib.*, i, pp. 173 and 170. Benedict's natural death and its same date are also given by the contemporary "Annali di Perugia", ap. *Archivio storico Ital.*, vol. xvi (1850), p. 60. See also the other authorities cited by Potthast, ii, p. 2037.

⁴ Ferreti, *Hist.*, i, 174.

⁵ Villani, *Chron.*, viii, 80; B. Guidonis, p. 673. "Die mercurii

taken up, and placed in the splendid mausoleum now to be seen in the left transept of the present Dominican Church. It is believed that the monument was the work of Giovanni Pisano, and was made to the order of cardinal Nicholas di Prato.¹ According to Crispolti, the early historian of Perugia, there were still preserved in his time Benedict's pontifical vestments, as also his walking stick which was wont to be kissed devoutly by the people "on the day of the Pardon".²

By the side of the Pope's tomb an inscription in poor Leonine verses engraved upon a marble slab gave, as it were, an abridgment of his life, but the day of his death, wrongly, as the sixth instead of the seventh of July.³

Contemporary authorities assure us that no sooner was Benedict buried than miracles were worked at his tomb. Among others, Prior Garsias, one of the envoys of James II. of Aragon, who was at Perugia at the time, in informing his master of the death and burial of the Pope, added: "On the day of the Pontiff's burial many sick came to his tomb and were cured. The same thing happened on the day after, so that a great devotion to

mane fuit sepultus in domo Predicatorum ante altare plane." Ep. of Garsias to James II., ap. Finke, *Mon. Arag.*, i, p. 176.

¹ Crispolti, *Perugia Augusta*, p. 104. For further particulars of the sepulchre of B. XI., see my *Tombs and Portraits of the Popes*, p. 52 ff.

² *Perugia A., l.c.*, Perugia, 1648.

³ Ap. *ib.*, p. 104 f., or ap. *L. P.*, ii, 472. It ran thus:—

O quam laudandus, quam dulciter est venerandus
Inclutus iste Pater, Prius extitit Ordine Frater
Sancti Dominici, Christi vigilantis amici.

* * * * *

Fit pater ipse patrum caput Orbis gloria Fratrum
Est merito dictus re nomine Vir Benedictus.

* * * * *

Hunc hominem tantum reddunt miracula sanctum
Innumeris signis dans grata juvamina dignis."

* * * * *

him has sprung up among the people, and is daily growing." ¹

On the strength of his blameless life, and these miracles, Benedict XI. was duly declared "Blessed" by Benedict XIII. in 1738, and it is interesting to observe that the most illustrious of Italian historians, Muratori, had a share in promoting the beatification.²

A review of
the period
of papal
history just
finished.

We have now brought to a conclusion the story of an interesting and important section of the long line of the Roman Pontiffs (1130-1305). This period of well over a century and a half will ever stand out in the history of the Papacy, for it was truly a glorious epoch of its perennial life, during which the Pontiff of Rome stands out as prominently in the political and economic concerns of kingdoms and rulers as in the government of the Church, and in the spiritual affairs of his children. "The figure of the Pope," says a distinguished student of the Middle Ages, "dominates everything. He holds the first place in universal veneration and in public prayers, and especially in those which were recited at the close of sermons."³ In the Church he was obeyed by every bishop in Europe,⁴ and in the State he was, to use the words of our own King Edward, "the overlord of every Prince—dominus omnium nostrum."

¹ Ep. ap. Finke, *Mon. Ar.*, i, p. 176. Cf. also the above epitaph and B. Guidonis, *l.c.*, who adds that: "quorum (the miracles) quædam non pauca evidentia et probata, alibi scripturæ memoriæ sunt mandata."

² Cf. Cipolla citing the *Epistolario* of Muratori, ed. M. Campori, vii, ep. 3010 of May 18, 1731.

³ Lecoy de la Marche in his well-known work *La chaire française au Moyen Age*, p. 317, quoting *MS. Lat.*, n. 16481 in the Bib. Nat., Paris, 1868.

⁴ Roger Bacon, *Comp. stud. philos.*, c. 5, ap. M. G. SS., xxviii, p. 581. "Episcopi generalem obedienciam debent archiepiscopis et Pape."

In the Church, indeed, the Popes did not stand out in quite the same way as they had during the first thousand years of their history. Then the Roman pontiff was without a rival. He was the acknowledged head of all Christians, he was the chief of an undivided Christendom. But, though it is true that he was then the head of all the Churches, his position among them was not very conspicuous. His direct power over a large number of them was but small, and his immediate contact with great masses of Christians was but slight. His really outstanding position was largely thrown into the shade by the power of three or four others. It was, indeed, known to all that the Patriarch of Rome was the head of the Catholic Church, that all the other Patriarchs were subject to him, that he was the last resort in all matters of faith, and that to him all could appeal from any other ecclesiastical authority.

The position of the Pope in the Church.

But difficulties about the faith did not arise every day; and with the various possibilities of appeal at home, not to speak of the obstacles to remote appeal arising from difference of language and distance, it was not so very often that appeals from other patriarchates found their way to Rome. As long as the Patriarchs of Antioch and Alexandria, and afterwards of Constantinople and Jerusalem as well, remained true to Catholic faith and practice,¹ sent their letters of communion to Rome, their *litteræ formatæ*, on their accession, and kept the name of the Popes on the sacred diptychs, they ruled their vast territories with very little reference to Rome. Whilst then these great branches of the Church Universal were

¹ If they did not, then their dependence on Rome became immediately manifest. See various letters of Gregory the Great in connection with the dependence on the Roman patriarch of one and all the bishops of the Catholic world. Epp. ii, 50 (52); iii, 30; ix, 26 (12); 27 (59), 202 (8).

in union with the Vine informed by Christ our Lord, they were so flourishing as almost to conceal the parent trunk, so that previous to the separation of the Greek and Latin Churches, previous to the more or less complete division in ecclesiastical matters between East and West, the bishop of Rome was hardly more than a shadow, great and imposing perhaps, but dim and distant, to tens of thousands of Christians.

If, however, after that disastrous event, the sole headship of the Church was denied to the Patriarch of "old Rome" by many churches, his position in the Church Catholic became ever more conspicuous. The great Patriarchs who at one time had almost overshadowed him, no longer drawing life from communion with him, have gradually sunk into obscurity; whilst the Popes, age by age, have become more and more obviously the Kings of that city on the Mountain founded by the author of Christianity. The fact that during the period of papal history which we have just closed, the Pope became the temporal head of the European commonwealth of Western Christendom, assuredly contributed no little to render his position more striking even in the Church. It must, too, be borne in mind that this position of the Popes among the Kings of the West did not come to an abrupt end with the death of Boniface VIII. Many who are now concerned to find a sanction for treaties may be surprised to realize that even as late as the days of Henry VIII. of England, they got their sanction from confirmation by the Pope.¹

¹ Hence during the Middle Ages one reason why temporal rulers were distressed at a long vacancy of the Holy See was that then there was no one to give a sanction to treaties. In 1293 James II. of Aragon could not, or would not, agree to a treaty "*quia in sede apostolica summus pontifex non erat per quem pacta et condiciones inter nos et ipsos nostros hostes inite, possent, ut expediat, aprobari [sic] ac eciam confirmari*". Document ap. Finke, *Acta Aragon.*, iii, p. 4.

There is no need here to emphasize the great temporal power of the Popes in the period under discussion. Even if our story has failed to throw it into relief, it is a matter of common knowledge. But widespread temporal authority is not of the essence of the Papacy. It may come and go, and the story of the lives of those Popes which we have still to tell, will show it on the wane. The still later history of the Papacy will witness the total disappearance of the direct international authority of the Pope in the international affairs of Christendom. It can, however, be affirmed that the hundred and fifty years during which they exercised this sway was a glorious period in the history of European civilization. Not to repeat what we said at the beginning of this epoch,¹ it will suffice here to state once more that it was during these years that were laid the foundations of true liberty, and that, in the highest domains of intellectual life and artistic culture, more progress was made than has been made in any corresponding period since. It was the international influence of the Popes which brought about that justice for all which is the basis of freedom ; which fostered intercourse and commerce, and which enabled the Universities to spread everywhere the light of learning.

How came it then that the Popes lost this influence in the temporal concerns of men which is so extolled for the benefits it conferred ? One cause was their own natural human weakness. Not being instituted by Christ for men's temporal success but for their eternal welfare, they cannot count on divine help to prevent ignorance,

¹ Cf. Vol. IX. Introductory Chapter. The reader will find a confirmation of much that is said there in Bishop Lightfoot's " England during the latter half of the thirteenth century " in his *Historical Essays*, p. 93 ff., London, 1895.

prejudice, or evil desires causing them at times to lead men astray from the path of secular well-being. In bewailing the "infinite corruption" of his time our worthy severe countryman, Roger Bacon, stigmatizes as holding the first place in it: "the curia Romana, the head." The Curia "which", he says, "used to be, and ought to be guided by the wisdom of God, is now degraded by those constitutions of lay emperors which are contained in the civil law."¹ The enemies of the Papacy made the most of its mistakes or faults. Emperors like Frederick II., who wished to usurp the place of the Pope in Christendom, and rulers like Philip the Fair, who in temporals would have no kind of superior on earth,² attacked the secular power of the Papacy by every means in their power. Yet it was taught at the time that "by divine law no one can rightly and legitimately hold any kind of temporal thing, if he wilfully fails to submit to the dominion of God, from Whom he has it, or if he does not use it properly. . . . And he who does not submit to ecclesiastical authority is not subject to God."³

The temporal power, too, of the Popes was open to attack not only by the bitter satire of licentious troubadours or of heretical or parasitical poets, but also by the unmeasured language of would-be reformers, such as the Cluniac monk, Guiot de Provins, who in the beginning of the thirteenth century wrote his Bible to denounce the evils of his times.⁴ But the real cause of

The real cause of the loss of temporal power by the Popes.

¹ *Compend. studium*, p. 398, in *Op. inedita*, R. S.

² Rocquain acknowledges that: "Il (Philip) combattit Boniface moins pour maintenir sa propre independance que pour briser celle de la papauté." *La papauté*, p. 231.

³ Cf. James of Viterbo, *De regimine christ.*, c. 7, pp. 241-2. "Non autem subditur Deo, qui non est subjectus ecclesiastice potestati."

⁴ Like many another of his tribe, he could find plenty of praise for

the loss of the temporal power by the Popes was neither the might of kings, nor the sword of poet or preacher ; nor, on the other hand, any fundamental abuse of it by the Popes themselves. We have seen them triumphing over the Empire. The pen of the poet could not prevail against them, and their own weaknesses were far outweighed by their strength. The real cause of their loss of world-wide temporal influence was the growing self-consciousness of the new nations of Europe. They could now talk a language of their own. They were sufficiently grown up. They could manage their own affairs. Samuel was no longer of use for them. They were quite capable of looking after themselves, and they would do so. Whether their self-government has begotten better results than their guidance by the Papacy, let those who lived through the Great War, or who have since grasped its significance decide.

But if, even for the general good, the Popes have lost the direct temporal influence they largely acquired and, in the main, well exercised during the age of which we are speaking, they have not lost, but have improved the spiritual position in the Church which they then developed so considerably. In matters of faith, we see Innocent III. declaring that all cases of greater importance were to be

Growth of
the spiritual
power of the
Papacy.

those to whom he was beholden, but none for the Pope who, he declares, ought to be as the Polar Star, but who is more of a devil and a murderer.

“ Molt est l'estoile et bele et clere,
Trex devroit estre nostre pere.
Clers devroit—il estre et estable,
Que jà povir n'eust deables
En lui, n'en ses commandementz.
Quant li pere ocist ses enfanz,
Grand pechié fet. Ha ! Rome ! Rome,
Encor ociras—tu maint home,
Vos nos ociez chascun jour,
Crestientez a pris son tour.”

Ap. *Hist. lit. de la France*, xviii, pp. 811-12.

referred to the Apostolic See.¹ In matters of Church government and discipline, Gregory IX. decreed that all metropolitans had to swear to render canonical obedience to the Roman pontiff,² and Clement IV. decided that the complete disposition of all ecclesiastical benefices belonged to the Pope.³ Finally, in matters liturgical, we see Pope Alexander III. reserving the canonization of Saints to the Holy See,⁴ and General Councils or custom reserving to the Roman Pontiff the right to authenticate relics,⁵ and alone of all bishops to have their feet kissed.⁶ Readers of these pages will perchance recall other facts, such as a more frequent reservation to themselves of the appointment to bishoprics, which serve to make even more clear the adage of the Fathers that where Peter was there was the Church. The story of the Avignon Papacy, and, strange though it may seem at first thought, that of the Popes of the Great Schism of the West which we have still to tell, will make it still more clear that the Roman Pontiff is the pivot of the Church. Doubt as to who was the true Pope threw the whole Church into distress. It only breathed freely when its doubts were dissipated by the election of Martin V. (1417).

¹ Ep. ap. Potthast, n. 1479, Sept. to Oct., 1201, or ap. *Decret. Greg. IX.*, lib. iii, tit. 42, c. 3, vol. ii, p. 644, ed. Freidberg. "Majores ecclesie casus, præsentim articulos fidei contingentes ad Petri sedem referendas intelliget, qui, etc."

² *Ib.*, lib. i, tit. 6, c. 4, p. 49.

³ *Sext. Decret.*, lib. iii, tit. 4, c. 2, ap. *ib.*, p. 1021. "Licet ecclesiarum, personatum, dignitatum, aliorumque beneficiorum ecclesiasticorum plenaria dispositio ad Romanam noscatur pontificem pertinere, ita quod, non solum ipsa, quum vacant, potest de jure conferre, verum etiam jus in ipsis tribuere vacaturis." See also in *Bullar. Rom.*, iii, p. 743, Aug. 27, 1265; or Pot., n. 19326.

⁴ *Decret. Greg. IX.*, lib. iii, tit. 45, c. 1, ap. *ib.*, p. 650, or Jaffé, *Reg.*, 9260.

⁵ C. 62 of the fourth Lateran Council of 1215.

⁶ N. 9 of the so-called *Dictatus Papæ*, ap. Jaffé, *Monument. Gregor.*, p. 174.

INDEX

- ACQUASPARTA, Matteo, card.,
145 ff., 155 ff., 218, 340 ff.
- Adenolfo, 374, 376 ff.
- Adolf, king of the Romans,
114 ff.
- Albert, count of Haigerlock,
118.
- Albert, king of the Romans,
15, 114 ff., 317, 456-7.
- Amauri, viscount of Nar-
bonne, 316.
- Anagni, peace of, 72 ;
sacrilege of, 371 ff. ; ruin
of, 453-5.
- Anatomy, Boniface VIII. and,
41-2.
- Andrew III. of Hungary,
106-7.
- Andronicus II., emperor,
467-9.
- Armenia, 394 ff.
- Arnold of Villanova, 415.
- Art, Boniface VIII. and,
183 ff.
- Asclokettes, Michel, 277,
287.
- "Ausculda fili," 321.
- Avignon, University of, 37-8.
- Aycelin, Gilles, 316.
- BALIOI, Robert, 249 ff.
- Bartholomew of Ferentino,
470.
- Beaulieu, Simon de, 84.
- Benedict XI., Pope : early
career, etc., 423 ff. ;
Dominican Provincial,
425 ff. ; Master General,
429 ; cardinal, 431 ;
elected Pope, 437 ; de-
nounces Anagni sacri-
lege, 441-2, 451 ff. ; and
Europe, 456 ff. ; and
Britain, 470 ff. ; death,
476-9.
- Benevento, 464-5.
- Benvenuto da Imola, 24.
- Berard de Got, card.-bp. of
Albano, 83, 267 ff.
- Bernard Guidonis, 28.
- Bertold de St. Denis, 364.
- Bianca, queen of Aragon,
73-6.
- Boccasini, Nicholas, 108 ff.,
273 ; *see also* Benedict
XI., Pope.
- Boniface VIII., Pope : family
and birth, 1 ; early years,
2 ff. ; career, 8 ff. ;
appearance, 12-13 ;
character, 13 ff. ; elec-
tion and coronation, 47 ff. ;
and Sicily, 65 ff. ; and
Hungary, 106 ff. ; and
the Empire, 113 ff. ; and
Italy, 133 ff. ; and Ro-
magna, 153 ff. ; and the
arts, 183 ff. ; and the
Colonnas, 205 ff. ; and
British Isles, 226 ff. ; and
France, 266 ff., 290 ff. ;
seizure of, at Anagni,
372 ff. ; death, 386-7 ;
judgment on, 411 ff.
- Boniface of Calamandrano,
79.

- Britain, and Boniface VIII., 226 ff.; and Benedict XI., 470-2.
- Bussa, Giffrid, 376.
- CALTABELLOTA, Treaty of, 103.
- Cardinals, created by Boniface VIII., 62-3.
- Carobert, 81-2, 106 ff., 432-6.
- Catherine of Courtenay, 66-8, 98.
- Cavalcanti, Guido, 25.
- Celestine V., Pope, 14, 47, 50 ff., 58 ff., 205-6.
- Charles I., 11.
- Charles II. of Naples, 47, 66 ff., 386, 391, 439-40.
- Charles Martel, 74.
- Charles of Valois, 66, 98 ff., 146 ff., 282, 467-9.
- Cholet, Jean, card., 315.
- Clareno, Angelo, 20.
- Clarentes, the, 84, 94.
- Clement V., Pope, 10, 247.
- "Clericis laicos," 238 ff., 295 ff., 444-5.
- Colonna, Giles, 10.
- Colonna, Stephen, 209-10.
- Colonnas, the, 53, 205 ff., 374 ff., 443-4.
- Communes, Boniface VIII. and the, 158-61.
- Constance, queen, 77-9, 85, 87.
- Constantinople, Benedict XI. and, 467-9.
- Corsica, 86-7.
- Courtrai, battle of, 286-7.
- Crusade, Boniface VIII. and, 61, 82 ff., 293; against Colonnas, 217-9.
- Crutched Friars, 403.
- DAMPIERRE, Guy, count of Flanders, 115, 276 ff., 308.
- Dante, 16 ff., 22 ff., 133, 459-60.
- Decretals, 32-4.
- Denmark, Boniface VIII. and, 404 ff.
- Dietrich of Nassau, 124.
- Donati, Corso, 144-5.
- Durandus, William, 154-5.
- EDWARD I. of England, 29-30, 53, 114, 226 ff., 266 ff., 397-8, 447, 470-2.
- Eleanor, queen of Sicily, 104.
- Erfurt, Chronicler of, 30.
- Eric VIII. of Denmark, 404 ff.
- FALKIRK, battle of, 250.
- Ferdinand IV. of Castile, 88, 96.
- Fermo, University of, 38-9.
- Ferrarius, William, card., 71 ff.
- Flemings, the, 276 ff., 318.
- Florence, 139 ff., 457-63.
- Flotte, Pierre, 284, 294, 309, 326, 329 ff., 347, 451.
- France, Boniface VIII. and, 266 ff., 290 ff.; Benedict XI. and, 445 ff.
- Frederick II. of Sicily, 66 ff., 440-1.
- Friars, Boniface VIII. and, 400; Benedict XI. and, 473-4.
- GAETANI, Benedict, *see* Boniface VIII., Pope.
- Gaetani, Pietro, bp., 7.
- Gaufredi, Raymond, 21.
- Gelasius II., pope, 1.
- Genoa, generosity of women of, 398-9.

- Gerald de Albalato, 100 ff.
 Gerard, abp. of Mainz, 456-7.
 Gerard, card., 9, 11, 96-7.
 Gerard de Pecoraria, 472.
 Ghazan, khan of Persia, 396-7.
 Giano della Bella, 140.
 Giotto, 184-9.
 Grand, John, abp., 404.
 Guglielmo da Bergamo, 32.
 Guido of Langasco, 154.
 Guido of Montefeltro, 17-19, 138.

 HADRIAN V., pope, 8.
 Halton, John, bp. of Carlisle, 40.
 Helen, queen of Servia, 465-6.
 Henry of Casolocci, 28-9.
 Henry of Ghent, 9.
 Henry of Newark, 229-31.
 Hildebrandinus, 153.
 Hugh, bp. of Byblus, 471.
 Hungary, 106 ff.

 IRELAND, 262-5.
 Isarnus, 405, 409-10.

 JACOBINI, Hugolini, 55.
 Jacopone da Todi, 23-5.
 James de Varagine, 134.
 James II. of Aragon, 29, 60, 66 ff., 242, 346, 393, 465.
 John, abp. of Kalocsa, 107 ff., 433-4.
 John I., count of Hainault, 115.
 John XXII., pope, 20.
 John of Châlon, 118, 139.
 John le Romeyn, abp., 53.
 Jubilee, institution of, 174 ff.

 LADISLAUS, 107 ff., 433 ff.
 Landulf, card. of S. Angelo, 71, 74 ff., 92.
 Langton, Walter de, 232 ff.
 Library of Boniface VIII., 196 ff.
 Lincoln, Parliament of, 253-4.
 Longhezza, manifesto of, 210-11.
 Loria, Roger, 68, 84, 86, 89, 97.
 Louis, St., king of France, 44-6.
 Louis of Toulouse, St., 53.
 Louvre, assembly at, 334-5.
 Lovetot, John de, 232 ff.
 Lyons, 311.

 MAGUELONNE, 315-16.
 Maria, queen, 110 ff.
 Mary, queen of Sicily, 75, 435.
 Meinhard, duke of Carinthia, 113.
 Miniaturists, employed by Boniface VIII., 184-5.
 Missions, foreign, Boniface VIII. and, 399.
 Monachus, John, card., 351 ff.
 Mortmain, Statute of, 236-7.
 Mouchet, Jean, 372 ff.
 Muñoz de Zamora, 426-9.
 Murro, John de, 10, 273.

 NARBONNE, 316-17.
 Nicholas III., pope, 8-9, 23.
 Nicholas IV., pope, 10-11, 53, 426.
 Nicholas of Prato, 458 ff.
 Nogaret, William de, 124, 287, 335-6, 359, 372 ff., 391, 446.

 ODERIGI of Gubbio, 184-5.
 O'Donnaver, Marian, 264.

- Ordo de Pœnitentia*, 428.
 Orford, Robert, 234, 289.
 Orlando, Cape, battle of, 92.
 Orleans, University of, 41.
 Orsini, Napoleon, card., 375.
 Orvietò, 157-8.
 Otho, duke of Bavaria, 112, 436.
 Oxford, University of, 40.

 PAGANUS, James, 156.
 Palestrina, destruction of, 222.
 Pamiers, University of, 39-40; made a City, 314.
 Paris, States-General at, 337; University of, 41.
 Peckham, John, abp., 11.
 "Perlato pridem," 142-3.
 Peter of Ansalone, 80.
 Peter of Aragon, 11.
 Peter of Blois, 298, 304.
 Peter, count of Caserta, 163-5, 392, 464.
 Peter, abp. of Monreale, 153-4.
 Philip IV., king of France, 60, 237, 266 ff., 291 ff., 445-7, 451.
 Philip, prince of Taranto, 74, 94-5.
 Pisa, 87, 138.
 Plaisan, William de, 287, 359 ff., 446.
 Pontoise, John, 284.
 Prato, 461-2.
 Provisions, 226-9, 471-2.
 Ptolemy of Lucca, 12.

 RAYNERIUS, 137.
 Revenue, papal, 168.
 Ricciardi of Siena, 32.
 Richard of Ferentino, 153-4.
 Rieti, earthquake at, 221-2.

 Rinaldo di Supino, 373 ff., 392.
 Robert of Anjou, 82 ff.
 Robert of Cornay, 153.
 Robert of Courtenai, 312.
 Roger de Flor, 467.
 Roger-Bernard III., count of Foix, 313 ff.
 Romagna, 153 ff.
 Rome, Boniface VIII. and, 162-3; assembly of, 346-7; University of, 35-7.
 Rosoni, Dino, 33.
 Rosso, Matteo, card., 48, 90, 345.

 SAISSET, Bernard, bp. of Pamiers, 313 ff., 319, 324 ff.
 Saltarelli, Lapo, 142-3.
 Sancho IV., of Castile, 88.
 Sardinia, 86-7.
 Savelli, Pandulf, 162, 217.
 "Scire te volumus," 331.
 Scotland, 249 ff., 288.
 "Scrutiny," Papal elections by, 49-50.
 Seguin, Hugh, card., 54.
 Sembat, king of Armenia, 394-5.
 Senlis, assembly of, 327.
 Servia, 465-7.
 Servites, order of, 473-4.
 Sicily, 65 ff., 440-1.
 Simon, bp. of Palestrina, 267 ff.
 Sion, bp. of, prophecy of, 388-9.
 Specialis, Nic., 27.
 Spinola, Porchetto, 15.
 States-General, 337.
 "Stations," Roman, Boniface VIII. and, 43-4, 173-4.

- "Super Petri solio," 368 ff.
 Sutton, Oliver, bp. of Lincoln,
 40.
 THOMAS of Chadsworth,
 262-3.
 Thomas of Corbridge, 231.
 Tuscany, 125.
 UBERTINO da Casale, 20-1.
 "Unam Sanctam," 347 ff.
 Universities, Boniface VIII.
 and, 35 ff.
 VENAISSIN, county of, 171-2.
 Venice, and Genoa, 133 ff.;
 and Padua, 463-4.
 Vieri dei Cerchi, 144-5.
 Visconti, Matteo, 137.
 Volcmar, 29.
 WALE, Thomas, 259.
 Wallace, William, 249, 260.
 Wenceslaus of Bohemia,
 108 ff., 242.
 William, card. of San
 Clemente, *see* Ferrarius,
 William.
 William de Bermingham,
 264.
 William de Hamilton, 228.
 William de Hotham, 262-3,
 274.
 William of Gainsborough,
 235-6, 259.
 Winchelsey, Robert, abp.,
 232, 243-7, 252, 260-1,
 273.
 Wynterburne, Walter of,
 447-8.

THEOLOGICAL LIBRARY
 CLAREMONT, CALIF.

9923

BX1070 .M3 1925 / vol 18
Mann, Horace K. (Horace Kinder), 1859-1
The lives of the popes in the early Mid

9923

BX
1070
M3
1925

V. 18

THEOLOGY LIBRARY
SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY AT CLAREMONT
CLAREMONT, CALIFORNIA



PRINTED IN U.S.A.

23-262-002

9923

